A bill (S. 7106) granting an increase of pension to Susan Bryant (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pen-

A bill (S. 7107) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Metropolis, Ill.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 7108) to authorize the purchase or construction of six new vessels, with all necessary equipment, for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and providing for additional surveys by the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Commerce. By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 7109) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 7110) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Drew; to the Committee on Pensions, By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 7111) granting a pension to George A. Atkinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 7112) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to muster Dr. John A. Bobb, deceased, a brigade surgeon, with rank of major, from assistant surgeon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7113) granting an increase of pension to Charles

E. Rogers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on

By Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. SMITH of Michigan): A bill (S. 7114) for the relief of Ethel Proctor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 7115) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin

S. Wilbur (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7116) granting a pension to Sarah Spencer (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 7117) granting an increase of pension to Fernando

W. Moon (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 7118) granting a pension to Lola I. Pope (with

accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 7119) granting an increase of pension to Imogene M. Burke (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING:
A bill (S. 7120) for the relief of persons making simultaneous settlements on the same tract of the public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (S. 7121) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Cohen; and

A bill (S. 7122) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry D. Geddings; to the Committee on Claims. By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 7123) to create a tariff board; to the Committee on Finance.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 217) to repeal an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$26,000 for the purchase of a tract of land known as the Macauley ranch, adjoining the United States Army post at Fort Missoula, Mont., for the use and benefit of the post as a target range, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20347) which was referred to the Committee

on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$27,500 for assistance to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on the District of Columbia, etc., of one clerk each at \$2,750, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. Senate Document No. 225, Sixtieth Congress, first session, entitled "Development of the American Ocean Mail Service and American Commerce," is out of print, and there have been many calls for it. I move that 1,000 copies be printed for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., Saturday, January 2, 1915) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 4, 1915, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 2, 1915.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the fol-

lowing prayer:

We bless, praise, and magnify Thy hely name, O God our Father, for the continuation of Thy gifts unto the children of men. In the sweep of time another year has passed into history, and we most earnestly pray that we may be the better prepared by its experiences to enter upon the new year, that it may bring to all Thy children peace, happiness, and good will, that Thy kingdom may be advanced and Thy will be done in every heart. In the name and spirit of Him who taught us life and the immortality of the soul. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday was read and

approved.

CHARLES A. COULSON.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 13698, to correct the military record of Charles A. Coulson, and concur in the amendment of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 13698. A bill to correct the military record of Charles A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was read.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20150, the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. BYRNS of

Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20150) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, Thursday I yielded one hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss], and he has not occupied the whole of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized

for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I sympathize with those who express impatience at the progress of rural-credit legislation, but I can not believe it possible that this legislation will be agreed to by the House without a full discussion of the principles which necessarily will give shape to the measure that will finally be adopted. I have been scrupulously careful to avoid any personal references which in any way can reflect to the discredit of any Member. I trust that it will not be considered discourteous, while I am discussing a principle applying to the entire subject of mortgage banking and not the provision of any particular bill, if I should prefer to continue until I shall have presented the arguments as I have prepared them without yielding to any gentleman on the floor.

When I was discussing the Moss bill and the Bulkley bill I was glad to yield to Members, even to the extent of being taken off the floor by the discussion that ensued before my remarks were concluded. But I am discussing no particular bill now, and I trust I may be permitted to continue in a con-

nected manner.

We now turn to the land-purchase act of Ireland which has been cited as a reason why our Government should extend direct financial assistance to the proposed system of mortgage banks. The activities of Sir Horace Plunkett and of his associates who organized the Irish Agricultural Organization Society are not projected toward the granting of land-mortgage credit, but to the organization of personal credit and of cooperation in production and distribution of agricultural products. The condition of Ireland at the time the land-purchase act was enacted is depicted by Herrick in his Rural Credits, as fol-

The country had appealed to God, to the State, to humanity, for sympathy, for aid, for dollars, and had become a mendicant among the nations. Steps had been taken, it is true, to solve the land question, but "fair rents," although fixed by the courts at a reasonable figure, were more than the tenants could pay. Nearly one-half of the inhabitants of Ireland had emigrated beyond the seas, and most of those who remained were living in mud huts or squalid hovels, inflamed with mutinous rage against the Government. The plight of the farming class was most wretched of all, for on account of their crude methods of cultivation and marketing foreign competitors were underselling them in the staple products for which the soil was best adapted, and the meager gains were shared between the landlords and the "gombeen" men.

Even these miseries alone were not sufficient to cause the English Government to enact the land-purchase act. Under the laws of the United Kingdom the Irish tenants owned the improvements on the lards or estates. These improvements had been constructed at their expense, and the law recognized the ten-ants' right of ownership. Thus there grew up a dual ownership, which was peculiar to Ireland alone. There were two owners with adverse interests, with different nationality and different with adverse interests, with different hardnarry in England, residence—one, the landlord owning the land, living in England, and drawing rents, and the other, the tenant owning the improvements, living in Ireland, and cultivating the soil. This condition not only led to ill feeling, but to actual warfare and to near revolution. Out of this difficult situation grew the land-nurchase act.

It would be interesting and perhaps instructive to continue this review so as to include all the countries which have adopted a program of social reform; but I have cited the leading nations of Europe which have the largest interests and the longest experience with mortgage banking. It can not be gainsaid that social reform has been an important factor in inspiring the founding of the State-endowed type of mortgage-banking in-

stitutions in European countries.

I wish to direct particular attention to the degree of service extended to agriculture by institutions which are founded and controlled by private initiative as compared with those which are endowed by the State in whole or in considerable part, either by subscription to capital stock or by a guaranty of debentures. In order to secure a considerable degree of thoroughness without continuing at too great length I will confine myself to the institutions of Germany. I have called attention to the important fact that the Credit Foncier holds less than 10 per cent of the rural mortgages in France. I will also be able to submit figures showing that State-endowed banks only hold 5 per cent of such mortgages in Germany. I do not include the mutual associations of borrowers, generally known as land-schafts among State-aid institutions. These do not have capital stock and the State does not in any manner guarantee their They are pure associations of borrowers, each debentures. member of which pledges individual mortgage security to the whole society in return for debenture bonds of the association and resting solely on the collective mortgages held by the association plus the liability assumed by the individual members for the payment of the debts of the association. Thus in no proper sense can it be said that these institutions have received grants of public money to loan to their members or to purchase any part of their bond issue; neither does the Government credit in any manner sustain the selling price of the bonds. The Government has extended the advantages of strict supervision and has conferred many extraordinary privileges which relate principally to the summary processes of collecting debts and of foreclosing mortgages without the ordinary delays or processes of law; they are also given judicial powers to fine their membership and to compel various kinds of personal services, either with or without compensation, while their member-ship in turn can not question these decrees of their officers or appeal to the courts to arbitrate any grievance any member may hold against his association.

In discussing State aid in relation to the landschaft associations, Cahill says:

Government grants were made to the earliest associations, but they were inconsiderable in amount and were rather advances to meet general initial expenses of organization and establishment. Thus the Kur and Neumarket Credit Institute obtained £3,000. After the Napoleonic wars certain assistance appears to have been granted in certain cases, but the amounts were not large (p. 42).

In this connection it should be stated that during the Napoleonic war Napoleon levied tribute on the landschaft associations in Germany and robbed them of all their reserves and available funds. It is thus probable that grants of public funds to meet organization expenses did not equal in amounts the tribute levied by the hand of war. These mutual associations are the parent bodies of all mortgage banks as we are now

considering that term, and thus it is established that mortgage credit, based upon debenture land bonds, was founded and established without grants of Government capital or credit; and these institutions present a successful history since the eventful day of July 25, 1770, a period of 144 years.

In Germany these associations originally were aristocratic and admitted only the higher classes of society to membership. It has only been recently that progressive ideas and democratic forces in society influenced their management, and I call attention particularly to the very important fact that this change of management, which is entirely in the interest of the small farmer, was brought about by the private joint-stock mortgage banks and not the State-endowed institutions, so highly lauded

by the gentleman from Ohio.

Thus it is established that private capital and private enterprise engaged in mortgage banking actually revolutionized the business methods and destroyed the privileges in the credit world which caste had conferred and sought to perpetuate. I

quote again from Cahill, page 53:

ACTIVE MODERN POLICY OF ASSOCIATIONS.

ACTIVE MODERN POLICY OF ASSOCIATIONS.

Within the last generation these institutions have, in general, shown themselves to be quite alive to progressive ideas. They have extended their eligibility for membership so as to include owners of small properties; they have increased the proportionate loans upon the security of property; they have introduced new branches of allied activity (e. g., banking and insurance); and they have adopted more flexible business methods, though always consistent with absolute security for bondholders. This general awakening is due to many causes, but not least has been the influence of the joint-stock banks. As a result it no longer occurs that a leading German organization of agriculturists, in high dissatisfaction with the backwardness of these associations, energetically advocates—as it happened in the early sixties—the foundation of joint-stock mortgage banks.

No higher tribute to the efficiency and usefulness or to the popularity among the farmers of Germany of the private mortgage banks can be paid than is contained in this extract. close student of German banking knows that the landschaft associations have approached closely to the business methods of their popular rivals. Each association has organized a private joint-stock bank to carry on the business of general banking, including the making of mortgage loans to nonmembers of the associations; and they make their loans in cash rather than in debenture bonds, as formerly; and that in all the new landschafts mutual liability is abolished and every borrowing member is responsible only for the amount of his own obligation. I submit this indisputable evidence that mortgage banking was originated without Government endowment and that the popular present-day methods were originated and introduced by privately owned and controlled banking institutions. It now only remains to show that State-endowed institutions do not carry any considerable part of the burdens of extending mortgage credit to the men actually engaged in agricultural pursuits in the German Empire and I will have completed my case.

The total farm mortgage indebtedness of Germany is estimated at \$2,000,000,000. That sum was stated to our commission by speakers assigned by the German Government to discuss the subject of German mortgage credit before us. I have noticed the same figures are given by writers of repute, so I will accept them. This vast sum is distributed among the different

classes of mortgage banking institutions as follows

Savings banks
Landschaft associations
Joint-stock banks
State and provincial banks \$850, 000, 000 750, 000, 000 170, 000, 000 100, 000, 000

(See Economic Quarterly for August.)

It thus appears that the mortgage banks in the German Empire which have been established for the whole of a State, Province, or of a district within a Province and whose liabilities are guaranteed by the public authority of such area only grant 5 per cent of the loans on rural real estate. In speaking of these banks which have been organized in Prussia, Dr. Augsbin, in his address at Berlin before the United States commission, said:

commission, said:

In the second place we must consider the district aid banks. These banks were founded about 50 years ago by the Provinces at the suggestion of the Prussian Government. The object was to further by means of these banks all works of general utility undertaken by the small communities and townships. The annuity banks of Prussia were established in Prussia in 1850 for the purpose of facilitating the redemption of old servitudes, encumbering the lands of peasants from feudal times, so as to enable the peasant farmer to buy off the feudal dues encumbering his lands. But I think that this form of credit is of no interest to the American farmer, who only needs cheap amortization credit on long-term mortgages to increase his productive powers, and only organizations similar to the Raffelsen or the German Landschaften are of real importance to him. (P. 392).

With these curt words this eminent authority dismissed the

With these curt words this eminent authority dismissed the State-endowed institutions of Prussia and disposed of the contention which the gentleman from Ohio professes to believe is threatening to wreck this 'egislation now proposed to this honorable body. I may say in concluding this discussion of these State-endowed mortgage banks in Germany that much of their business is quite familiar to American citizens and is the same class of expenditures as we carry on under direct public authority, such as the issue of bonds for drainage, irrigation, and road building, or by municipalities to own and operate public ntilities, such as waterworks, municipal lighting systems, street railways, and similar public improvement enterprises. I am told that the State of Massachusetts guarantees the bonds issued by certain improvement districts to construct a system of public waterworks. Indiana likewise delegates public authority to the issue of bonds to improve lands lying in certain drainage districts This kind of public improvement is so familiar with us that it does not merit extended discussion, yet it accounts for the organization of many State-endowed mortgage banks in Europe or more particularly in Germany.

There are many other special factors which operate in Europe and which are not present in the United States. Luzzatti, who is the father of cooperative rural credit in Italy, in an address before our commission, in Rome, stated that the savings which Italian emigrants in the United States send back to their native country did more to render possible the extension and upward march of credit in Italy than all the efforts of the ministers of the treasury-and Luzzatti is one of those ministers. If it be true that the savings of our foreign-born citizens which are sent back to the European Continent is a greater factor than any aid which the Government is able to extend in establishing systems of rural credit in those countries, then shall it be contended and can it be true that rural credit can not be successfully organized in this country without the grants of direct subvention from the Federal Treasury? But it is said that no successful mortgage system has ever been organized for small borrowers without such aid. This statement deserves some attention and elaboration.

The tracts of land in Europe are very small as compared with farms in the United States. I saw many farms in Germany which were mere strips of land not exceeding 30 feet in width There were three Americans in our party in a tramp through rural Germany. We took photographs of many German farms rural Germany. so small that a person standing at each corner of the strip would show in the Kodak picture. German loans are made on the basis of the income of the land and not on its actual commercial value. In a general way this is true of all unrecallable long-time loans on the Continent. The theory is that only amounts can be safely loaned on a tract of land which can be repaid out of the income after deducting the cost of cultivation. All speculative values are excluded; and the income values are those taken by the German Government in assessing taxes. The result has been to make it difficult for small landowners to secure accommodations from those institutions which issue debenture bonds and are thus under the strict supervision of the Government. This one element has done more to limit the volume of rural business done by joint-stock banks in Germany than any other thing. The two joint-stock banks in Germany which do so large a proportion of the rural-loan business have been given the right to make an independent appraisement, and thus actually advance a larger proportion of the real value of the land than other private banks are permitted to do.

This feature accounts in part for the large business done by

the savings banks, which charge a slightly higher rate and do not grant unrecallable loans. If the small farmer were to accept the small advance which he could get under their system of appraisement under a first mortgage and then be forced to borrow under a second from a private lender, the high rate on the second mortgage more than counterbalances the lower rate on the first mortgage. Naturally the borrower prefers to make his terms with savings banks or with private lenders. It is the system of valuation and not any defects in the system of banks which causes the results which are commonly pointed out as defects in the system of decentralized European banks. In a centralized system, like that of France, the cost of negotiating the loans adds to the difficulty by making the expense prohibitive to small borrowers in the remote parts of the Republic. In general, it may be said that a successful system of land-mortgage credit must contain the instrumentality to carry the machinery in some form to close proximity to the lands of the borrower.

I have thus demonstrated, first, that mortgage banking business based on land bonds was founded without the aid of public cash or public credit; second, that its methods of administration were perfected and made popular with the average farmer by the ability and energy of private bankers; and, finally, that the vast volume of all rural mortgage business is transacted by agencies operating without Government crash. I therefore submit that in the face of this record there cash. I therefore submit that in the face of this record there can be no justification for the contention that no useful rural-

credits legislation can be perfected except by the grant of public money or the hypothecation of the public credit.

The attitude of Secretary Houston has been called into question, and there has been a concerted effort to make it appear that the administration has abandoned rural-credit legislation. I sympathize with those who may express an impatience at the delay in securing tangible results. However, there is no room for a charge that the legislation is being designedly delayed. It was generally admitted that our commercial system of banking was the poorest in the world, but years were spent in discussion and education, and it finally required the firmness and influence of the present administration to overcome the difficulties and to enact the Federal reserve law. The system has barely gotten into operation, and the administration is nearly two years in power.

The gentleman from Ohio referred to Mr. Herrick. reason it may be of interest to those who are criticizing the delay to mention that I had the honor on my return from Europe to deliver a message from Ambassador Herrick to Secretary Houston, urging careful consideration on the part of the administration of any proposed legislation on this subject, and expressing the opinion that the greatest danger was that enthusiasm rather than thorough knowledge might seek to dictate the terms of the law.

President Wilson personally assured our commission of his interest in this legislation, and that it was his desire that bills might be framed and presented to Congress at an early date. Without attempting to dictate the terms or draft of any measure which our commission might undertake to frame, the President frankly stated his objection to any direct grant of public money or to the guaranty by the Federal Government of the securities which might be issued by the proposed mortgage banks. He expressed cordial approval of the proposal to exempt mortgages and land bonds based upon them from all forms of Federal and local taxation, not as a subvention from the State to the banks, but as a measure of justice and advantage to the debtor. He approved the creation of adequate machinery within the Federal Government to give whatever assistance that might be thought to be helpful and necessary in the organization and supervision of these proposed instrumentalities. I have never understood from any authoritative source that the President has altered these views; on the contrary, he has appeared before Congress and has asserted them in a state paper or address. It remains also to say that the President expressed himself cordially in favor of chartering by the Federal Government of a system of personal-credit banks, which should be designed particularly for the use and benefit of the tenant class of farmers wherever such banks might be needed or helpful to the agricultural interests of the Nation.

Secretary Houston has at all times been interested in the progress of this legislation, and has never hesitated to express his personal views or to offer the assistance of the experts in his department. He promptly organized a division on rural credits and began a systematic study of the condition of agricultural credit in the United States, a work which was never before attempted by any authority. In his annual report he states that his department is now in position to give assistance to any committee of Congress to frame a personal-credit law, a work which so far as I am aware has not as yet been attempted by any Member of either House.

I beg to eall your attention to the statement in regard to personal credits contained in the Secretary's annual report on page I quote as follows:

The students of rural credit recognize the desirability of another piece of legislation which may properly be had at the hands of the several States or of the Federal Government, namely, legislation authorizing and encouraging local personal cooperative credit associations. Some States have already taken steps in this direction and others are contemplating taking them. The Department of Agriculture has made earnest investigations in this field and is in position to offer suggestions as to legislation and as to the form and operations of rural-credit cooperative associations. cooperative associations

The Secretary has thus placed his great department in a position well in advance of that occupied by Congress on this sub-The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] complains that the Secretary failed to make his position clear as to what kind of an instrumentality he favored. The Secretary in his report discusses the question with great directness and frankness. The failure of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] to comprehend the Secretary's position is due to the fact that he failed to quote the Secretary's language entire. In his quotation from the Secretary's report he omitted one sentence, though quoting all other connecting sentences. This one sentence would have made the meaning clear. The Secretary said:

gency which requires or justifies the use of the Government's cash or the Government's credit.

The gentleman from Ohio failed to quote that last sentence, though he did quote in another connection the sentence which immediately follows it.

Mr. BULKLEY. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. BULKLEY. I intend to print with my remarks the en-tire discussion of Secretary Houston on rural credits and omit nothing. I notice the gentleman has quoted a part of a sentence from the Secretary's report, and I hope that when he prints his remarks the whole of that sentence will be put in.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. The gentleman is mistaken as to any division of sentences. The sentences are taken entire, though but a part of the paragraph appears. The entire paragraph will appear in Secretary Houston's letter, which will appear as a part of my remarks.
Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. With pleasure.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman also quote the President's message when he said that we would not take up ruralcredit legislation at this session?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I shall always be glad, on any proper occasion, to quote any official utterance which President Wilson

may make.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman comment on the fact that there are only two States in the Union that could take advantage of rural-credit provisions on account of the record and foreclosure laws of any Federal act that might possibly give rural credits to the people? There are only two States in the Union that could take advantage of it, and those are Iowa

and Wisconsin.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in reply to my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Howard], I beg to say that the Moss-Fletcher bill as it is drawn can go into operation in every State in the Union without any further action on the part of State or Federal authority. The debentures can not be accepted as a legal investment for trust funds except in those States whose laws respecting land titles, exemptions, and foreclosures are considered to be such as to give proper security to the debentures which may be issued. This decision is left to the commissioner of land banks under the bill as it was originally drawn. I am informed that the Bulkley-Hollis bill does not differ radically from the Moss bill in these provisions except that the specific requirements of State laws are not set out in the Bulkley bill but are left to the discretionary power of the Federal supervising power. not the intention of either bill, as I understand the Bulkley bill, to interfere with State laws. We designedly drew the commission bill so as to offer inducements to State authorities to adopt uniform State regulations concerning land registration, conveying, and exemptions, but the operation of the law is not dependent upon the State adopting such regulations.

This language of the Secretary supports the position assumed by the United States commission in its report. Our language

is as follows:

GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL AID UNWISE AND UNNECESSARY.

In considering the question of the establishment of institutions under Federal charter, naturally the question of Government aid came under discussion. The commission, from the beginning, has been convinced that not only was Government aid unnecessary, but that it would be unwise. The farmers of the country do not desire any special privileges, and the idea of special privilege is, moreover, antagonistic to the spirit of our institutions. Government subvention is not needed. The security of our farms, the value of which is reported to be over \$40,000,000,000 and yielding an annual product of the gross value approaching \$10,000,000,000, is ample for the creation of a liquid security; which will be readily accepted by investors and which will enable the farmer to use his asset of land as readily as the merchant uses his stock of goods. The farmer needs no special privilege and wants no special privilege, and none should be extended to him.

On the same page of his report the Secretary gives his opinion as to the type of an institution which should be chartered. He says:

It is the judgment of the best students of economic conditions here that there is needed to supplement existing agencies a proper land-mortgage banking system operating through private funds just as other banking institutions operate, and this judgment is shared by the leaders of economic thought abroad.

Here is again a clear statement as to the type of institution the Secretary approves, and is in strong support of the recommendation of the United States commission. On page 30 of our report we used the following language:

Moreover, the commission became strongly convinced that the individual institution is best suited to the American people, and that the exercise of governmental activities should be largely confined to a rigid supervision, after allowing the widest latitude to individual effort and initiative.

Again, on page 29 of the Secretary's annual report, he reviews the main provisions of the Moss-Fletcher bill and of the Bulkley-Hollis bill, and concludes by saying:

A plan of this kind, operating through private funds, should work safely, and would probably result in a short time in systematizing credit transactions in rural districts and in reducing the interest rate.

Here is a specific indorsement by the Secretary of the principles contained in the Moss-Fletcher bill with no qualifying clauses. The Secretary has never been called upon to indorse specifically the language of the various sections of the bill. Its authors did not present it as a finished bill. It was presented as a basis for a successful and scientific system of land mortgage banks suited to American needs and conditions, and as such its principles have the complete indorsement of the administration.

Senator Hollis has stated on the floor of the Senate that the Bulkley-Hollis bill in all its principal features is similar to the Moss-Fletcher bill, but that they had modified some of its provisions and, in his opinion, had improved it. The Bulkley-Hollis bill is not acceptable to the administration in so far as it includes the principle of grants of public money and grants of the public faith and credit of the United States to sustain

the selling price of their securities.

The issue is thus joined. I yield to no man in my desire to The issue is thus joined. I yield to no man in my desire to give the American farmer every legitimate advantage which can flow from wise legislation, but I am willing to take my stand with the administration. The American people have faith in the wisdom, patriotism, and integrity of President Wilson. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They are willing to trust his interpretation of our platform promises. The Democratic Party has never promised subventions or subsidies to any class of the American people and the reak and file will gladly support of the American people, and the rank and file will gladly support the responsible leadership of the party in its refusal to yield to demands for a violation of our fundamental principles; and I desire to go on record now as predicting that this legislation will be enacted under the administration of Woodrow Wilson and agreeably to the promises and pledges of the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

I take pleasure in submitting the following letter from Secretary Houston. The Secretary's position was perfectly understood by every careful reader of his annual report, but as some have professed to be in doubt the Secretary calls attention to those passages of his report which clearly define his attitude and express his friendship toward this proposed legis-

lation. His letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, Washington, January 2, 1915.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, January 2, 1915.

Hon. Ralph W. Moss,
House of Representatives.

My Dear Mr. Moss: Of course I am greatly interested in rural credits and in securing proper Federal and State legislation on the subject at the earliest possible moment. The subject is a very difficult one and it is of the utmost importance that the right beginning should be made. In spite of very clear expressions in my annual report and in public statements I have made, an erroneous impression concerning my attitude has been conveyed to the public in several ways and especially through the headlines of some of the newspapers. In some cases the headlines indicate that I am opposed to rural-credits legislation, notwithstanding the fact that the subject matter of the news items indicates very clearly that I favor rural-credits legislation, including not only a land-mortgage banking system, but also cooperative personal-credit institutions. It has been difficult for me to see how anyone could misinterpret my statements. It is true that I have not entered at length into a discussion of the details of proposed measures. I have consciously avoided doing so. It is our uniform practice to avoid commenting in detail on proposals pending in the Congress, except when committees of the Congress refer measures to the department for comment. Notwithstanding this practice I have indicated in my report in a general way some of the features of measures pending in Congress with a favorable expression of opinion. You know, of course, of the President's interest in rural-credits legislation and recall his message to Congress December 2, 1913, in which he presented "the urgent necessity that special provision be made also for facilitating the credits needed by the farmers of the country." He pointed out that the pending Federal reserve bill would do the farmers a great service; that it would put them on an equal footing with other business men and masters of enterprise; and that "what they need and should obtain is legislation w

institutions. The following quotations from his book will make his position quite clear,

Very truly, yours,

D. F. Houston, Secretary.

QUOTATIONS.

THE PROBLEM.

Closely related to the production and distribution of farm products is the securing of capital by farmers on better terms. This problem has attracted the profound attention of the country and still awaits a full solution. The problem is one of extending the banking machinery and facilities more intimately into the country districts for the convenience and the assistance of the rural population and of the effective mobilization and utilization of the resources of the country people themselves.

AID THROUGH GOVERNMENT MONEY OR CREDIT.

The chief difference of opinion arises over whether there should be special aid furnished by the Government. There seems to be no emergency which requires or justifies Government assistance to the farmers directly through the use of the Government's cash or the Government's credit. The American farmer is sturdy, independent, and self-reliant. He is not in the condition of serfdom or semiserfdom in which were some of the European peoples for whom Government aid was extended in some form or other during the last century. He is not in the condition of many of the Irish farmers for whom encouragement and aid have been furnished through the land-purchase act. As a matter of fact, the American farmers are more prosperous than any other farming class in the world. As a class they are certainly as prosperous as any other great section of the people—as prosperous as the merchants, the teachers, the clerks, or the mechanics. It is necessary only that the Government, so far as geographic and physical conditions permit, provide machinery for the benefit of the agricultural classes as satisfactory as that provided for any other class, and this the Government has attempted and is attempting to do.

LAND-MORTGAGE BANKING SYSTEM NEEDED.

LAND-MORTGAGE BANKING SYSTEM NEEDED.

It is the judgment of the best students of economic conditions here that there is needed to supplement existing agencies a proper land-mortgage banking system operating through private funds, just as other banking institutions operate, and this judgment is shared by the leaders of economic thought abroad.

Notwithstanding the fact, however, that the people of the United States have ampler financial agencies than any other in the world, and have developed the habit of using these agencies to a greater extent than any other people, students of rural problems have been keenly alive to the need of further improvements. They have insisted upon extensions of the national banking facilities and the creation of special agencies in intimate touch with farmers with a special view to the betterment of financial conditions in the country. At least two definite measures have been prepared and have received special consideration. They are similar in many respects. They provide, in brief, for land-mortgage associations with small capital, which may make loans on farm mortgages within a district of a State or within a State to the extent of 50 per cent of the real values of the farms. The money arising from such loans is to be used for productive purposes on the farm on which the security is based. It is contemplated in one way or another, either through separate associations or through a central agency, that debenture bonds may be blanketed on the mortgages and offered to the public. It is proposed that the operations of the system shall be supervised by a central agency in Washington and that there shall be adequate safeguards in the way of examination and inspection. It is thought by students of the question that such debenture bonds would be safe, would attract capital, and would bring into the investment field, especially, small holdings scattered through the country which do not now easily find satisfactory investments. A plan of this kind, operating through private funds, should wor

COOPERATIVE PERSONAL-CREDIT UNIONS NEEDED.

COOPERATIVE PERSONAL-CREDIT UNIONS NEEDED.

The students of rural credit recognize the desirability of another plece of legislation which may probably be had at the hands of the several States or of the Federal Government, namely, legislation authorizing and encouraging local personal cooperative credit associations. Some States have already taken steps in this direction and others are contemplating taking them. The Department of Agriculture has made earnest investigations in this field, and is in position to offer suggestions as to legislation and as to the forms and operations of rural credit cooperative associations. Such associations as these will perhaps render their largest service in the sections of the country where there are many small farmers whose individual resources may not be sufficient to enable them to secure the requisite credit. Their largest field for operation would probably be the South. Characteristics of such associations of small farmers are unlimited liability of members, the pledging of the faith of each to the other and of the whole to the lender, the use of funds for clearly defined productive purposes, and the supervision by the association of the use made of the funds. It has been objected that the feature of unlimited liability will prevent the organization of such associations in this country, but in certain sections of the country the liability of small farmers is already unlimited, and this could not be said to be an insurmountable obstacle.

The quotations from Herrick's Rural Credits referred to by

The quotations from Herrick's Rural Credits referred to by Secretary Houston are as follows:

NEEDED ACTION IN UNITED STATES VERSUS STATE AID (P. 480).

NEEDED ACTION IN UNITED STATES VERSUS STATE AID (P. 480).

The first step to be taken in order to extend cooperation and to introduce cooperative credit among farmers is, of course, the enactment of proper legislation. Already there are good laws on cooperative associations in many States. These ought to be codified in every State and the bad laws repealed. Wherever it could be done without interfering with present development and existing conditions, the laws on cooperation in each State should be reduced to one statutory act. There does not have to be one law for credit societies and separate laws for associations for other cooperative purposes. One law could be made to fit them all; and this would be the best plan, because then the regulations would become standardized as regards organization, administration, and management. The farmers of the United States do not need any special privileges or State aid. If methods were simplified and technicalities eliminated, cooperation, or organized individualism, based on private initiative and mutual self-help, would eventually be applied to all their activities. They would accomplish this most quickly and successfully by starting with the credit society as the local unit formed and operated on the principles of Raiffelsen.

EFFECT OF COOPERATION ON INTEREST

Character of security: A great deal of misinformation on European cooperation has crept into the United States. The societies, it has been asserted again and again, grant cheap and easy credit at interest far below current rates, down to 3 and even 2 per cent, upon character alone. No statement could be further from the truth. Only in Italy is character credit ever accorded, and there, too, only now and then by Luzzatti's urban banks in the form of "honor loans" to indigent persons out of a small portion of their profits which they can afford to lose set aside each year as a pure act of charity. With this small exception there is no cooperative credit society in Europe which does not demand of borrowers as safe security as is exacted by an ordinary bank. Moreover, interest rates are never below those on sound and marketable securities except where the State has advanced public funds to be distributed in free or cheap loans.

The nearest the societies come to extending credit on character is when they permit a member to draw against an uncovered open account up to an agreed amount. Only those members who have unencumbered and readily attachable property, however, are allowed this privilege, while the agreed amount of the account is fixed at considerably less than the ascertained value of their property. Chattel mortgages and pledges of personal property are not uncommon, while the credit societies have been tempted even to assist members to acquire small holdings on real estate mortgages and have invested their surpluses in such securities. Serious consequences have resulted from this practice. The entire rural cooperative system of the Grand Duchy of Hesse has been shaken to its foundation by thus tying up funds of the credit societies, but bitter experience is gradually teaching cooperatives to let real estate mortgages alone. The preferred security is the indorsement of one or more responsible parties, and, with the rare exceptions noted, the societies will not extend credit on anything less. The societies th

STATE AID-HISTORY (PP. 13-15).

Many governments assisted and even created institutions whose purpose was to compensate dispossessed lords or supply them with capital to hire labor in place of the liberated serfs, or to furnish these freedmen with the means to purchase farms; and this plan is still being followed to encourage young men to go back to the land or to remain mon if

to hire labor in place of the liberated serfs, or to furnish these freedmen with the means to purchase farms; and this plan is still being followed to encourage young men to go back to the land or to remain upon it.

But wherever this intervention occurs it is motivated by the old feudal notion which led kings to believe that the land and its occupants belonged to them and should be subject to their particular care. As the rights and duties dropped away from the lords they passed over to the kings and finally lodged in constitutional governments. Feudalism was frequently replaced by paternalism. England, Sweden, Norway, Germany, and some of the flourishing small States did not develop along this line, but all the other large agricultural nations took this bent, and treated the agricultural classes as dependent wards, if they gave them any friendly consideration at all.

Literature teems with stories of the ignorance, poverty, and degradation of the continental European peasants up to a half century ago. Masses of them are still so poor that they do most of their work by hand, carry their produce to markets on their backs or in carts drawn by themselves or their wives, and are forced to use every miserable little economy to keep body and soul together. To call an American farmer a peasant would be to insult him, although the equivalents of the word in foreign languages convey no offensive meaning. This shows what agricultural conditions in Europe are as viewed by American eyes. The majority of peasants are landless or own plots too small to be mortgaged and have no chance to obtain more on their own standing alone. Hence they are able to get real estate credit only by cooperation or from institutions assisted or privileged by the state.

The feudal system did not gain foothold on American soil, so the United States has never had a complicated variety of tenures and gradation of ranks, the removal of which called for severe remedies. The principles of equality which presided at the Nation's birth have been consta

STATE AID-FRANCE-EFFECT (PP. 344-345).

Nothing, however, has yet come to light to enable a forecast to be made of the direction which future development will take. Indeed, the future is very uncertain. State aid, which has been so lavishly extended in France, has registered a conspicuous failure when considered from the viewpoint of the hopes entertained in 1899. Even its partisans are far from satisfied with the progress made, and are now contemplating amendments to the laws in order to bring about vital changes in the Credit Agricole Mutuel. To say nothing of the dependence upon funds officially supplied, the intimate relations between the system and the Government bind together the financial destinities of both. The occurrence of a great war, for instance, which only served to prove the absolute solidity of the self-reliant Germany system in 1870, might imperil the very existence of this French State-aided system. No one can foretell, of course, what will happen; but perhaps, as the years roll on, larger numbers of members of the Credit Agricole Mutuel will appreciate the value of the principles of self-help maintained by the Federation of the Farmers and Workmen's Bank, with unlimited liability, and, in a lesser degree, by the Central Federation, and then the full meed of praise will be bestowed upon Rostand, Rayneri, and espe-

cially upon Louis Durand, who for over a generation have been fighting the good fight for mutual self-help and pure cooperation.

STATE AID-AUSTRIA-HUNGARY-EFFECT (PP. 878-879).

The success achieved by this Crown-devised and State-aided cooperative credit system of Hungary was a surprise even to those who conceived it. The system was established purely as an experiment, but it now covers 7,777, or over one-half, of the parishes of Hungary. It has stamped out usury and revived agriculture within that area, and has given a strong impetus to the cooperative movement which is now spreading throughout the land. But it has defects and shortcomings which are becoming more apparent with time.

The intervention of the State has deadened the spirit of self-help. The arrangement which deprives the farmers of direct representation in the management of the center, and even compels them to accept persons not of their own choosing for certain offices in the local societies, violates the important principle of cooperation and retards the development of individual independence. Great numbers of the societies have been formed and are managed by the priests, teachers, notaries, or large landowners in the neighborhood, and the members have no mutual feeling for one another, but join simply with the object of benefiting themselves alone. The artificiality arising from this outside control has created distrust of the system in banking circles. Coupled with this distrust is the enmity aroused by the official favoritism displayed and the class legislation enacted for farmers, and as a result the center, which is now mostly agricultural, finds difficulty in negotiating its debentures and rediscounting the paper of the local societies. Indeed, the system is badly in want of money for extending its activities, and the minister of agriculture recently acknowledged that unless it can attract more deposits or establish better relations with existing financial institutions, the State will have to be called upon for further assistance.

STATE AID-ITALY-CHARACTER (P. 363),

None of these various central banks which the Government has set up for central, southern, and insular Italy is allowed to do business with the farmers directly if there are any rural banks, consortiums, or agricultural bodies, either of an incorporated or cooperative form, to serve as intermediaries, particularly of the cooperative kind, while they have the right to inspect and supervise the reorganization, if necessary, of those with which they have dealings. These central banks are, in fact, the official organs of the Government for introducing cooperative credit among poor or ignorant farmers who lack the standing and initiative to help themselves. Several of them were called into existence and endowed with public funds in consequence of earthquakes, pests, and plagues, which devastated wide areas, and they assisted, it is true, all who applied until normal conditions were restored. But usually they give preference to the smallest loans offering the highest security. The banks of Naples and Sicily are allowed considerable discretion, but strict rules for according credit have been laid down for the rest. In Liguria, for instance, the maximum loan is \$600 for three years. The money may be used only for the purchase of live stock, implements, or machinery. Loans of \$200 may be granted for two years for the purchase of fertilizer or for the necessaries for planting blennial crops. Loans for the same amount may be granted for only one year for other purposes of cultivation and harvesting. It will be seen that these State-aided banks of Italy are not for large or well-to-do farmers.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Burke] to use some of his time now

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I have no requests for time. desire, however, to discuss briefly one or two provisions in the bill, and it will be quite satisfactory to me, and I am sure it will be to this side of the House, to begin the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule, if there may be an understanding that when certain items are reached the five-minute rule will not be enforced. I will say to the committee that I will not consume probably more than 20 minutes or possibly half

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, that will be en-tirely satisfactory to this side of the House. I also have a statement from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and from the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] to the effect that they desire to discuss certain features of the Choctaw matter when it is reached under the five-minute rule, but that now they are willing to begin with the reading of the bill.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I will say

again to the gentleman that I am quite willing to have the bill taken up now for amendment under the five-minute rule if we may have that understanding.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when a certain item which I wish to discuss for a longer time than five minutes is reached under the five-minute rule I may have 30 minutes, and if the request is granted I will waive the time that is assigned to me in general

debate, which is an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that when a certain item in the bill in which he is interested is reached he may have 30 minutes in which to

discuss it. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] may proceed for one The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, what I desire to do is to call to the attention of the Members of Congress here, and to those who may read this morning's Record, the fact that the unfinished business on Calendar Wednesday is the consideration of a double lightly statute that is supposed to affect the ocean a death-liability statute that is supposed to affect the ocean only, but which does affect every coast State and all the Great Lakes States, and which takes away from the States jurisdiction in the matter of death on steamboats, which is very broad, and which substitutes an archaic, ancient, out-of-date statute, that it would be an absolute disgrace for this Congress to pass. I hope that the Members of Congress who have not been paying any attention to that statute will consider it and study it before next Calendar Wednesday. I believe, for instance, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], who is going to be governor in that State soon, if he would look at the statute would be crusading against it and fighting it in every way possible. believe that gentlemen from the Great Lakes region would fight it, and also gentlemen from Florida and Louisiana and Texas, and all coast States. Jurisdiction is to be taken from the States, and it is not to be fully restored as to its most sub-stantial remedies to the Federal Government. If it was going to be retained in its entirety and effectiveness it would be different, but they are going to wipe out to a great extent the chance of widows and orphans and those who have claims against steamboats collecting them by giving jurisdiction over to the Federal judges in the admiralty court, where there is no jury trial. In the State courts there is a jury trial. It seeks to take away a great many of the privileges that claimants have by applying the most archaic rules known to the lawyers of the Shipping Trust.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washing-

ton has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Chairman of the committee if it is not possible at this time for us to make some unanimous-consent agreement with reference to taking up the Choctaw item, fixing the time for debate, and the division of the time?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be agreeable to both sides that when we reach that item the gentleman from Mississippi shall control 30 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma 30 minutes, as we had agreed on

Thursday.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think that I have ever agreed to

that, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Car-Why not by TER] have 30 minutes each of general debate. unanimous consent change that so that it will be taken out of the general debate and the time be consumed when that item in the bill is reached under the five-minute rule?

Mr. HARRISON. That would be satisfactory. Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask that that agreement be made.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he might make it 45 minutes on a side.

Mr. MANN. That would not limit the time under the fiveminute rule.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman could get time always.

Mr. MANN. That can be done at that time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when the Choctaw item in the bill is reached under the five-minute rule, under the head of the Five Civilized Tribes, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] may have 30 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Carter] 30 minutes in which to discuss the item.

Mr. MANN. That is, transfer the 30 minutes of general debate to debate under the five-minute rule when that item is

reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that when the item in the bill relating to the Choctaws is reached the gentleman from Mississippi may have 30 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. That does not interfere with the ordinary pro-cedure under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. No. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of paying the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and in full compensation for all offices the salaries for which are provided for herein for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, namely:

For the survey, resurvey, classification, and allotment of lands in severalty under the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. L., p. 388), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians," and under any other act or acts providing for the survey or allotment of Indian lands, \$125,000, to be repaid proportionately out of any Indian moneys held in trust or otherwise by the United States and available by law for such reimbursable purposes and to remain available until expended: Provided, That no part of said sum shall be used for the survey, resurvey, classification, or allotment of any land in severalty on the public domain to any Indian, whether of the Navajo or other tribes, within the State of New Mexico and the State of Arizona, who was not residing upon the public domain prior to June 30, 1914.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I see that this item is decreased from \$150,000 to \$125,000. How much unexpended balance is there for the last fiscal year? My recollection is that the commissioner or Secretary, in making his report, says that this allotment work has very materially decreased.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that

the unexpended balance is \$89,241.59.

Mr. MANN. If they had an unexpended balance of \$89,000 out of an appropriation of \$150,000, with the statement of the department that the work of the department is materially decreased, what is the need of making an appropriation now almost

as large as was made before?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Because they have outstanding contracts with persons to do certain surveying work that have not yet matured, and they are still being employed in carrying out that work, and it is necessary, in order to meet those contracts that have not yet matured, that this balance be withheld.

Mr. MANN. I notice that the report of the Commissioner of

the Indian Office on page 44 has this to say:

During the past two years the quantity of allotment work handled in the field has decreased materially. A few years ago the office had as many as 18 allotting agents in the field at one time, while to-day we have but three. This is due partly to the fact that practically all the Indians on reservations containing lands susceptible of agricultural development without irrigation have been allotted.

Now, if that is the case, what is the necessity of making a larger appropriation. That does not indicate that there are a lot of outstanding contracts. What is the necessity of making a large appropriation and swell the appropriation if the money

is not to be expended? Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to House Document No. 1287, a letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a statement of cost of survey and allotment work, Indian Service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, in which they set out in full each item of expenditure and how expended and where, and it is a complete statement.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and that indicates that there is no need

for that large appropriation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is a justification for the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. It is a justification for what they have expended, but it is not a justification for making an appropriation much larger than they need for that particular service.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that I have none of these lands in my State, and I will yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Burke] who has a lot in

his State. Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I will state that when I saw, as I did see the other day, the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in reference to allotment work which the gentleman from Illinois has just read it occurred to me, in view of the fact that the hearings disclose that there had been an unexpended balance of \$89,000 last year of this appropriation, that the amount could be further reduced. I took the matter up with the Indian Office, called their attention to the report, and also called their attention to what their estimates showed with reference to the unexpended balance, and they went over the matter fully with me and showed that they would need this money for the next fiscal year by showing the different reservations where allotment work is being done, and that much of it is used in the survey on Indian reservations where the money is paid to the General Land Office, which does that work. They also called attention to the fact that under the present practice allotments are being made by the superintendents at agencies instead of regular alloting agents, and that there was a great deal of work being conducted in the way of allotment, and a full written statement of it is being prepared, but has

not yet reached me from the Indian Office; and I am going to ask leave to extend in the RECORD the statement justifying the necessity for having \$125,000 for the next fiscal year for the work of survey and allotment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois

has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, just a minute more. Of course, if they need the money, I am quite satisfied. The statement in the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs does not indicate that they need the money. The commissioner is a very good commissioner, but he ought not to make such a sloppy statement in his report if the facts do not justify it. His report indicated they do not need the money. Now, the information he furnishes the gentleman from South Dakota says that they do need the money. Well, he ought to be more careful, for we are supposed to read his annual report, but we are not supposed to know his private opinion.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting the statement which was furnished by the Indian Office in refer-

ence to this item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The statement is as follows:

The statement is as follows:

With reference to allotting agents, while it is true that the number of these officers has been greatly diminished, yet in making these decreases advantage has been taken of the provisions of section 9 of the act of June 25, 1910 (35 Stat. L., 855-859), which authorizes allotments to be made on reservations by the superintendents or agents in charge. In your own State, on the Cheyenne River, Rosebud, Crow Creek, and Standing Rock Reservations, allotments have been and are now being made by the superintendents. On the Pine Ridge Reservation Mr. Bates is still employed as allotting agent, and although his work is nearing a close, yet under the law allotments may be made to newly born children as long as any lands remain unallotted.

The estimate of \$125,000 for surveying and allotting Indian reservations is a conservative one. Probably \$75,000 of this amount will be required by the General Land Office in survey work, notably on the Northern Cheyenne or Tongue River Reservation, Mont., to complete surveys of the Pueblos in New Mexico, to survey the Papago or San Xavier Reservations in Minnesota, to survey the Goshute Reservation boundaries have not been properly identified. This would leave \$50,000 for allotment work, including salaries, and for forage, equipment, materials, various other incidental expenditures, and for emergency work.

Allotments are now being made on the Glia River Reservation in Arizona, where there are several thousand Indians to be provided with land. On the Hoopa Valley Reservation, Cal., surveys are required, and there are approximately 500 Indians to be allotted. There are also about the same number to be allotted on the Duck Valley Reservation in Nevada. It may be added that many of the tracts purchased for Indians in California under the acts of June 21, 1906 (34 Stat. L., 325-333), April 30, 1908 (35 Stat. L., 70-76), and subsequent acts, have not yet been subdivided for the purpose of allotments in severality, and that while the expense for surveying and

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of obtaining some information. I see at the bottom of this paragraph, the last three lines, these words:

Who was not residing upon the public domain prior to June 30, 1914.

Why was that incorporated in the bill? Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is on the second page of the bill?

Mr. HARRISON. The last paragraph.
Mr. STEPHENS of Texas (reading). "Provided that no part of said sum shall be used for the survey, resurvey," lines 11 to 17. inclusive?

Mr. HARRISON. No; just the last three lines of that paragraph containing the words "who was not residing upon the public domain prior to June 30, 1914."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That was for this reason. That

the Navajo Indians of the States of New Mexico and Arizona have heretofore been permitted to go off the reservation and take land as citizens of the United States could take it under the public-land laws of the United States.

It seems that at that date they were forbidden. There was a provision in the last Indian appropriation bill to the effect that thereafter they could not take that land, and that is the reason

for this.

Mr. HARRISON. That is now permanent law?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; that is permanent law now, Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the gentleman, further, Is the work that is required respecting the appraisement of these lands finished now?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This provision, as the gentleman will see, does not provide for the appraisement. It says:

That no part of said sum shall be used for the survey, resurvey, classication, or allotment of any land in severalty on the public domain to fication, or any Indian-

And so forth, and it does not provide for an appraisement.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what I asked about, whether there was any necessity for a further appropriation for appraisement purposes, and if not, since in prior bills it has been carried, whether the work of appraisement is now over?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think so. But it is not esti-

mated for by the department.

Mr. HARRISON. Previously the word "appraisement" was included with the terms "reclassification and allotment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes. The reason for that was that allotments were made to the Indians, and then there was an unsurveyed domain, belonging to the tribe, that had to be sold and that had to be estimated for and appraised; and that is the reason why the word "appraisement" was left in the There is no reservation of that character now.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, purchase and use of irrigation tools and appliances, water rights, ditches, lands necessary for canals, pipes lines, and reservoirs for Indian reservations and allotments, and for drainage and protection of irrigable lands from damage by floods, or loss of water rights, including expenses of necessary surveys and investigations to determine the feasibility and estimated cost of new projects and power and reservoir sites on Indian reservations in accordance with the provisions of section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910, \$250,000, reimbursable as provided in the act of August 1, 1914, and to remain available until expended: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended on any irrigation system or reclamation project for which specific appropriation is made in this act or for which public funds are or may be available under any other act of Congress; for pay of one chief inspector of irrigation, who shall be a skilled irrigation engineer, \$2,500; for traveling and incidental expenses of two inspectors of irrigation, including sleeping-car fare and a per diem of \$3 in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty in the field and away from designated headquarters, \$3,200; in all, \$259,700; Provided also, That not to exceed seven superintendents of Irrigation, six of whom shall be skilled Irrigation engineers and one competent to pass upon water rights, and one field-cost accountant, may be employed: Provided further, That the proceeds of sales of material utilized for temporary irrigation work and structures shall be covered into the appropriation made therefor and be available for the purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes a point of order on the paragraph just read.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. To what item?

Mr. MANN. To the paragraph. This covers the repair of ditches and the purchase and use of tools and appliances and everything of that sort, and is made available until expended. I am aware that this item was carried in other appropriations, but inserted by another body. But what is the necessity and object of making an appropriation for maintenance of irrigation ditches available until expended, contrary to all the ordinary principles which we adopt in making appropriations? I can understand why it may be desirable and necessary to make an appropriation for construction of irrigation ditches available until expended, but, for maintenance and repair, why is not that a current item, to be taken care of without accumulating a large surplus?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman please indi-

cate the page and line on which that occurs?

Mr. MANN. Page 3, line 5. Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That must have been an over-I do not think it is necessary for that to remain there. Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, that, I take it, applies to the

first part of the paragraph, for the construction, repair, and

Mr. MANN. It would apply to everything in the paragraph. Mr. CARTER. It would not be necessary for it to apply to maintenance, but it has been the rule, as the gentleman knows,

to make it apply to construction.

Mr. MANN. Where we make a specific appropriation for the construction of an irrigation ditch it has been quite customary to make the appropriation available until expended, and there is very good reason why it is necessary; but where we make a general appropriation every year for maintenance and repair, including some construction, I can not see any reason why that should be made available until expended.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I think that follows the language of the bill last year, but I agree with the gentleman from

Illinois

Mr. MANN. It does follow the language of the bill. Of course, it is true that the Indian Office, like every other bureau Mr. ST and department of the Government, would like to have appro-

priations made which they can hold until they want to use them; but after all it is better in making these appropriations to make them annual, as far as possible, so that we shall know something about how much money is likely to be expended in the ensuing year, because we will have to provide for the raising of the amount.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will offer a motion to strike out the words "to remain available until

expended."

Mr. MANN. I will move to strike it out on a point of order, and also, at the bottom of page 3, the item which provides that the proceeds of sale of material used for temporary irrigation work and structures shall be covered into the appropriation made therefor and shall be available for the purposes of the appropriation. What is the necessity of violating the usual rule that we have that the proceeds of sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have no objection to that going

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentle-man will permit an interruption, I will state that it has been the policy of the Committee on Indian Affairs not to carry any such provision, and I had supposed this was out. I think it is in there inadvertently, and it ought to go out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the language on page 3, line 5, "to remain available until ex-

pended," and also to the last proviso following the word "employed," on line 21 of page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire

to discuss the point or order?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I concede the point of order on

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order on the whole paragraph. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice you have an item here for the pay of one chief inspector of irrigation, on lines 9 and 10 of page 3, and on line 11 "one assistant inspector of irrigation, who shall be a skilled irrigation engineer, \$2,500." Are those new offices?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They are not.

Mr. HARRISON. Are those provided for by law? Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the gentleman what is meant by "traveling and incidental expenses of two inspectors of irrigation, including sleeping-car fare and a per diem of \$3 in lieu of subsistence"? Do you intend to mean by that that one traveling in the field in the discharge of his duties gets \$3 a day for subsistence, and in addition to that he gets his actual traveling expenses; that is, lodging and railroad fare, and all those things?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This is for traveling and incidental expenses, including sleeping-car fare and a per diem of \$3 in lieu of subsistence, when actually employed on duty in the

field and away from the designated headquarters.

Mr. HARRISON. Would it not be better if the paragraph were made to read "For actual necessary traveling expenses when actually employed on duty in the field and away from designated headquarters"? Would not that include all necessary expenses of subsistence and lodging and travel?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is the language carried in

all the appropriations for any similar service, and this has to be in that shape so as to be audited properly.

Mr. HARRISON. It does not have to be in that shape be-

cause the other items are carried in this form, does it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The language has been used in all the bills for many years.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the gentleman think the other

form would be better? Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It would be subject to some

objection. Mr. HARRISON. If the actual necessary traveling expenses

of one of these inspectors were paid they might not amount to as much as the railroad fare and \$3 per diem for subsistence.

Mr. CARTER. I think it would amount to a great deal more than \$3 per diem. The object of putting in the \$3 per diem was to fix an amount which they might not exceed, so that they might not pad their expenses, and in order that there might be a definite amount over which they should not go.

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chair-

man.

Mr. FOSTER. I renew the point of order for a moment. Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to ask him a question for information.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. How many Indians are the United

States caring for at this time?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There are something over 300,000 in the United States. About 101,000 of them are in Oklahoma and the rest are distributed throughout the United States, mainly in New Mexico, Arizona, South Dakota, and Montana,

Mr. FALCONER. And some in California. Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Are any of them located in the State of Michigan?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We have an Indian school in Michigan whose pupils are being cared for, and there are possibly a few scattered bands of Indians elsewhere in the State.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether he has made any general investigation or had specific hearings to determine how the irrigation carried on by the Indian Bureau articulates with the irrigation carried on under the general reclamation act of 1902? The gentleman will recall that while I was on the committee we used to wonder and tried to determine if there was not a good deal of duplication of work between the two bureaus; and I want to ask if there have been any new developments in the last few years as to the irrigation carried on by the Indian Bureau and the irrigation carried on by the regularly constituted irrigation bureau under the act of 1902?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that the new bureaus are both under the Secretary of the Interior, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And I will say that the appointments have been made with a view to having harmony between them, and I do not think that at the present time there is any friction between the Indian irrigation service and the irrigation

by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. FERRIS. I did not particularly have in mind any personal hostility or personal antagonism that there might between the two bureaus; but as the chairman of the committee well knows, they are both under the Interior Department, both appointed by the Interior Department, and both conducted there, with the Indian Department as a last resort for the Indian irrigation. I wondered if the chairman of the committee had ever conceived of a plan whereby the general Reclamation Service and the Indian reclamation service might be brought together, and not have two bureaus operating.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do not see how that could be done, because of the fact that, as the gentleman well knows, the public lands are under the control of his committee, and we have a Public Land Commissioner and an Indian sioner. Each one of them has jurisdiction of lands. The lands may be in the hands of white citizens of the United States and a strip may run through an Indian reservation or an Indian reservation may border upon them. It is necessary for the two to act in harmony, and yet each must act within his respective

jurisdiction.

Mr. FERRIS. I know it is necessary for them to act in harmony; but as both bureaus are under one head, every time we take up an irrigation matter in the Indian Office or every time we take up an irrigation matter in the General Reclamation Office we finally wind up in the Secretary's office; and I have been wondering if we could not hurdle one of these bureaus and get to the Secretary of the Interior a little quicker.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do not see how it would be possible, considering the rights of the citizens who are not wards of the Government and the rights of the wards of the Government, one being presided over in one bureau and the other in

Mr. FERRIS. I have no specific amendment to offer, and no point of order to make, and no particular criticism about it. It simply seems to me that if the two services could be brought together and consolidated into one, so that you could get your finger on what they were both doing, and how they were doing it, and how much money was being spent, it would be a good idea to have the work done in that way. I wish the Indian Committee—and the chairman knows I am very fond of every member of that committee-would look into the advisability of trying to blend the two bureaus under the Interior Department and see if they could not save a little money.

Mr. COX. Vill the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Would not the gentleman's committee, over which he presides as chairman, have jurisdiction of legislation of this kind?

Mr. FERRIS. We of the Public Lands Committee have no jurisdiction of irrigation matters. As the gentleman from Indiana well knows, they have a regular Committee on Irrigation,

and irrigation matters go to that committee. We do not have anything at all to do with irrigation.

Mr. COX. Your committee has general jurisdiction over matters relating to the Interior Department, has it not?

We have to do with the disposition of the Mr. FERRIS. public lands.

Mr. COX. And with nothing else?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; a number of things; and we have something to do with the establishment of parks, although we do not appropriate for them.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman is clearly right in his idea

as to what ought to be done.

Mr. FERRIS. Here is the Interior Department, which is the head of the irrigation system. The Secretary of the Interior finally determines whether there shall be any Indian irrigation or not, and whether there shall be any public-land irrigation or not, and we finally wind up in his office. It does not make any difference which one of the bureaus we go to, the question whether or not there shall be any irrigation is determined in that office. Why can not the same Reclamation Service, lawfully constituted under the act of 1902, handle this entire matter, and let it be one comprehensive system, so that when the gentleman from Indiana or myself make an inquiry as to how much money has been expended for irrigation, or to know how much irrigation has been actually going on, we can find out without ramification through so many departments or bureaus?
Mr. COX. What committee of the House would have juris-

diction of the two bureaus if it was combined?

Mr. FERRIS. Well, the Committee on Irrigation, probably. The House parliamentarian passes on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make

the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the observations of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris] in regard to the two reclamation services under the Interior Department. It had occurred to me, as it has to the gentleman from Oklahoma, that it might be possible and proper to consolidate the two services, but after investigation of the matter pretty carefully, in connection with an enterprise with which I am familiar, I came to the conclusion that it would not be wise to attempt to have the Reclamation Service carry on the work under the Indian Bureau.

It will occur to the gentleman from Oklahoma what some of the difficulties are. First, the Reclamation Service in general is a work under a special fund, and has to do largely with great enterprises. Further, that service carries on its work largely by contract, and builds its projects very permanently and very thoroughly and finishes carefully. The same permanence and careful finish is not required on all Indian work. The Indian reclamation bureau claims to have made a better record for economy than has the Reclamation Service. may in part be due to the fact that the Indian Bureau has been of the opinion, and I think properly, that in constructing these Indian projects it was not necessary to build them in all cases as permanently as the Reclamation Service builds its

Further, and I think this is the most serious obstacle in the way of consolidating the two services, it is desirable that the Indian labor should be employed so far as possible in the construction of these reclamation projects or ditches and canals on the Indian reservations. Possibly that employment increases the cost of the project in some cases, although not ordinarily, but I doubt if there would be as much Indian employment under the Reclamation Service as is had under the Indian Service. It is almost as important to teach the Indians how to work and how to build and maintain reclamation projects as it is to reclaim their lands, and the Indian Service endeavors, in building the projects, to train the Indians themselves in the construction of irrigation work and to give them a training under which they will be able to maintain them after they are built. The Indian irrigation construction, take it all together, from the repair and upkeep of projects built and the execution of projects under way to the inaugurations of projects large and small, is so intimately associated with the numberless other activities of the Indian Service on behalf of the Indians that it should be kept directly under the supervision and control of the bureau.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, is there a point of order

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foster]

reserved a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the officers, the engineer, and the assistant inspector of irrigation. There is no law to authorize it.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] said that there was.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The general authority for the

Indian Bureau in the control of the Indians' property by the United States Government will be found in the United States Statutes at Large, volume 24, when the Bureau of Indian Affairs was organized under the War Department.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been exercising jurisdiction ever since. These Indians are the wards of the Government, and, as has been frequently decided by the courts, it is the duty of the Government to control the property and take care of the property. In these arid Western States, where there is no water, they can not produce the crops unless they can get water on it, and as a part of the duty of the Government to control the property and put it in condition for the Indians they organized this bureau of irrigation, and they have to-day this service, with the officers, for the purpose of building dams, ditches, and supplying the Indians with water and making the land valuable. It comes under the general authority of the United States as exercised for nearly 100 years for the control of the Indians' property, and never has been questioned.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the only question is as to this act of 1910, which does not give the authority for the appointment of these officers, nor does it create these offices. think there is any provision of law for the creation of the

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Texas any cita-

tion for the Chair that authorizes these offices?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It was authorized after the bureau had taken into consideration the necessity for the irriga-It carried with it the authorization of the right to appoint the men for the care of the irrigation projects, the dams, and so forth. It is in force now, and nearly all of them are being operated under the control of the Government. The Government having first adopted the project, appropriating the money for carrying them into effect, they are now distributing the water to the Indians in different parts of the country. It is absolutely necessary that these officers should have the care of the property of these Indians in the manner that is suggested here.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, of course there is no question that this appropriation is in order so far as the repair and maintenance of the irrigation projects are concerned. I am inclined to think from the laws that we have passed that it is in order as to the construction of irrigation ditches where no more than \$20,000 can be used in one place. That part that appropriates specifically for officials is probably subject to a point of order, but it was originally put in as a limitation; and is it not wiser to let it remain in as a limitation rather than to give to the department authority to pay such salary to them as it may choose out of the lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my colleague may be correct as to that, and yet I think there ought to be some provision for

these positions, if they are to be put in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Of course, you can not very well make specific provision of law providing for these places, because they may need them this year and they may not need them this year. That is left to Congress to determine; but they might employ a skilled irrigation engineer at a higher salary than \$4,000 year, if you make a lump-sum appropriation and do not put in a limitation. There is no doubt that we have authority to make appropriations for irrigation purposes, I think, and certainly for repair and maintenance; and is it not wiser, if we do that, to appropriate specifically for some of the higher-salaried offices rather than to leave it to the department?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to state that the act of 1910 fully provides for these officials, and if the Chair has any

doubt about it I will send the statute up to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will accept the statement of the gentleman from Texas that the act fully provides for that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It does; and I would like to have it inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to withdraw the

point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws

the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Harrison:
Page 3, line 12, after the figures "\$2,500" strike out everything in that line and lines 13, 14, 15, and 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"For actual, necessary traveling expenses of two inspectors of irrigation, when actually employed on duty in the field and away from designated headquarters, \$3,200."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be modified so that it will read down to "\$3,200" in line 16. It strikes out all of line 16 as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 12, after the figures "\$2,500," strike out everything in that line and in lines 13, 14, 15, and 16 down to the figures "\$3,200" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For actual, necessary traveling expenses of two inspectors of irrigation, when actually employed on duty in the field and away from designated headquarters."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the

point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that this amendment is in the interest of economy. The provision as it reads now is for traveling and incidental expenses of two inspectors of irrigation, including sleeping-car fare and a per diem of \$3 in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty, and so forth. In other words, the way the provision reads now it might give one authority not only to put in an account for the actual traveling expenses, but also for incidental expenses, and railroad fare and sleeping-car fare, and allow \$3 per day in addition to that with which to buy food. I submit that in all of the appropriation bills, as a rule, such provision as this read for actual or necessary traveling expenses, and in my opinion there is no good reason why, because the department in the past has written this provision in this way, it should not be changed.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does not the gentleman believe it might increase the amount allowed? Suppose one were to It might increase the amount allowed? Suppose one were to go into a dining car and order a meal that cost possibly \$5. This is limited to \$3 a day. I think the amendment would result in enlarging the amount instead of decreasing it.

Mr. HARRISON. I can not see how a man is going to spend

over \$3 a day on a trip for necessary subsistence unless he is unreasonably extravagant—at least more so than would justify these employees from being-and if you give him actual, necessary traveling expenses, if he is a good man and if he is honest with the department, he is going to put in his account with the expenses incurred, which were actually and necessarily expended, but in this way, if a man while out on duty spent only 25 cents for a meal during the whole day, he could put in his account for \$3 and make \$2.75 on the transaction.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gen-

tleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this language is inserted in the interest of economy. Some of the employees, such as those in other departments, are allowed as high as \$5 a day, and I think the uniform rate is \$4. In the Indian Service we have limited it to \$3, which is the minimum amount. I am quite certain that unless it is limited there will be extravagance, and it will cause some of the employees of the Government, in my opinion, to get into trouble, because they will be charged with excessive traveling expenses or expenses for sub-This language certainly ought to remain in the bill. sistence.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, this is in keeping with the action of the House during this session of the House. We have provided that Members of the House should receive only necessary and actual traveling expenses for themselves and

family.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman cite any case where it has been so limited changing from the practice that has heretofore obtained?

Mr. HARRISON. On the question of mileage we have provided that only necessary and actual traveling expenses shall be to ourselves for ourselves and the members of our families.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is with respect to Mem-

bers of the House.

Mr. HARRISON. I recall in the Consular and Diplomatic bill that we let it read that way. That is my recollection about it, and my recollection is that the other bills so provide.

The time of the gentleman from Missis-The CHAIRMAN.

sippi has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think the ger.tleman from Mississippi is in error. I do not know whether he intends by his amendment to cover subsistence as a part of the allowance or not. The amendment does not so state.

Mr. HARRISON. That was my intention.
Mr. MANN. It would not be covered by "traveling expenses," I think.

Now, the practice has been, in recent years, to put in these limitations. It is inevitable that after a little while a man who is allowed his actual subsistence stopping at hotels will have a subsistence account of more than \$3 a day, and even where he is stopping at country hotels as would be the case here, I take it. Some of the departments allow \$5. tendency of Congress in recent years has been to cut the amount down. In the Post Office appropriation bill some years ago we reduced the amount to certain inspectors from \$4 to \$3 a day at the outside, and most of them now pay \$4 a day, and if we do not allow \$4 a day in lieu of subsistence what we would pay would be \$5 or \$6 a day. The \$3 a day limitation for subsistence to a man who is traveling is economy to the Government, because that is less than he probably spends.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians, \$75,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move, in line 2, page 4, that the figures "\$75,000" be stricken out and "\$125,000" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 2, strike out the figures "\$75,000" and insert "\$125,000."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amend-

ment will not be adopted.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard, because it strikes me as a very strange and peculiar action of the Committee on Indian Affairs that in this day of intense prohibition feeling, when the prohibition sentiment has become so strong throughout this country that only two weeks ago a majority of this House voted for national prohibition, that that committee should attempt to economize by reducing the appropriation to stop the illicit sale of liquor among the Indians. I doubt that any other committee of this House would have the audacity at this time to withhold from a branch of this Government a sufficient sum to suppress this hellish traffic, the illicit sale of liquor among the Indians of this country. Especially am I surprised when I read from the hearings before the committee this language used by the assistant commissioner, Mr. Meritt. I read from page 28, where he says—and I want to say right here they asked in the estimates for this work \$125,000. is what the Bureau of Indian Affairs desired, and went further and said they could use \$200,000. Mr. Meritt says:

In this connection I wish to say that Commissioner Sells is exceedingly interested in this item, and we both feel that a much larger appropriation than is requested could be used in the suppression of the liquor traffic among the Indians throughout the United States. The commissioner was busy at the office with important matters and could not appear before the committee to-day, but asked that I especially emphasize the urgency of a much increased appropriation for this work. We could use probably \$200,000 to good advantage in the suppression of the liquor traffic among Indians.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding that appeal from the Indian Department, stating that they could use \$200,000 in this work, the committee in their generosity have only appropriated \$75,000 for the work. It strikes me if there is one item appropriated for in this bill that is just this is the one item. A liberal appropriation should be in this bill to suppress this illicit liquor traffic. I am again surprised, Mr. Chairman, that with three Members on the Committee on Indian Affairs from the progressive and prohibition State of Oklahoma, where they have embedded in the very constitution of that State the prohibition of sale of liquor, that they, being on that committee, should allow an appropriation bill to come out of the committee reducing this appropriation for this most temperate, deserving, and laudable work. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Indian Affairs will repudiate their action in cutting down this appropriation by voting for my amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be adopted. We have given a sufficient amount of money to protect the Indians, and if the committee will turn to line 17, page 8, they will find this language:

For pay of Indian police, including chiefs of police at not to exceed \$50 per month each and privates at not to exceed \$30 per month each to be employed in maintaining order, for purchase of equipments and supplies and for rations for policemen at nonration agencies, \$150,000.

Now, the object of giving this \$150,000 to these Indian police was to protect the Indians of the country from the trouble that we find in the Indian country and prevent them from having intoxicating drinks.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield to me in that connection?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman does not mean to say that this appropriation to employ police is used specifically for the suppression of the illicit traffic of intoxicating drinks?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As the gentleman has stated, it is one of the greatest evils in the country, and one of the greatest duties these Indian police have to perform, and the great trouble they have to contend with is to prevent these bootleggers from invading these reservations. I have been on these reservations, I will say to the gentleman, and have examined into this matter very carefully, and that is one of the greatest duties that these police have to perform at the present time. If whisky is taken away from these Indians, they are peaceful people and attend to their own business strictly and do as well, if not better, than many white persons if you can stop this liquor traffic.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, if the gentleman's argument is good with respect to appropriations for the Indian police, may I ask the gentleman why he reduced the appropriation from \$200,000 in that item in 1914 and in 1915 to \$150,000 this time?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. For the reason that nearly all the Indians, I presume 75 per cent of them, are in States now that have State prohibition, and it is the duty of the State courts and the State sheriffs and the State constables and the entire constabulary force of every State to prevent the sale of these intoxicants; and you will find in every State where these Indians are living that the officers of the county and State are doing their best to protect the Indians from the sale of these intoxicating liquors

And not only that, but let me state to the gentleman further that the Federal courts have jurisdiction, and the Federal courts have their marshals and deputy marshals all over the United States, and they are seeking out these bootleggers and they are sending them by swarms to the various United States penitentiaries; and the State officers are doing the very same

thing

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman has made a very good argument in support of my motion.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think not, Mr. Chairman. connection with these other means that we have of protecting these Indians we have given them a sufficient amount, and more than a sufficient amount, for this service.

Mr. FALCONER. The gentleman from Texas has just stated that quite a considerable territory that was formerly wet, where Indians lived, is now dry. The gentleman makes the argument, then, that prohibition does prohibit?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It does in that territory of which I am speaking. But the gentleman knows as well as everybody else that there are bootleggers everywhere in the States. are bootleggers in the city of Washington and other places.

Mr. FALCONER. Did the gentleman take that into consideration when the Commissioner of Indian Affairs made his representations in his report on page 22 that he could use \$225,000

in this service?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They can use perhaps a million dollars, for that matter, but we do not think it is necessary. We think the Indians are perfectly protected with the amount recommended here-\$75.000.

Mr. FALCONER. Was the fact that the State of Oklahoma went dry taken into the consideration of the matter by Commis-

sioner Sells?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I can not tell what entered his I can not read men's minds.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to The CHAIRMAN. Does the the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; I yield to the gentleman. Mr. BARTHOLDT. If it costs \$75,000, or \$100,000, or \$125,000, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] suggests, to enforce prohibition in the Indian Territory, what is the gentleman's calculation of how much it would cost to enforce national prohibition throughout the States of the Union?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman is a better authority than I am on this question, and he can answer his own

question.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] will be adopted. It is only a difference of \$25,000.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. A difference of \$50,000.

Mr. WEBB. I want to offer an amendment to make it \$100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Webb] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment: Strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$100,000."

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, the reason why I move to make the amount \$100,000 is because that is what has been appropriated for the last three or four years by this Congress for that work. I do not understand that the \$150,000 that is to be appropriated under another section is to be used at all for protecting the Indian nation or the Indian people from the liquor traffic. The \$150,000 that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] refers to in the bill is for the purpose of keeping order among the poor Indians whom some white man has made drunk and put them in jail for disorder. It is much better to prevent crime than to punish it after it is committed, and the \$100,000 is suggested here for the purpose of preventing crime, whereas it is proposed to appropriate \$150,000 for punishing crime after the crime has been committed, due to the introduction of "firewater" by "bootleggers," usually trifling white men.

I do not think this Government has ever adopted the golden rule in its treatment of the Indian. I think perhaps the saddest page in all the history of our country is the story of the American Indian and his treatment by the white man. He is as helpless as a child when you set whisky before him. told that he will part with anything he has, even with his wearing apparel, in order to get whisky. I think it is bad to economize to the extent of \$25,000 when we owe to the Indian in this country every protection that can be thrown around him, and especially protection from the greatest evil that can attack him, and that is liquor. I hope the House will put the amount at least to \$100,000, which has been appropriated here-The Commissioner of Indian Affairs says he can use I am willing to appropriate that, and even willing to appropriate a million dollars in order to protect the American Indian, who is fast fading away.

Mr. MANN. Did I understand that the Indian police were used only to detect drunkenness where it is found to exist, and not to prevent the sale of liquor to these Indians?

Mr. WEBB. I believe so, chiefly. Mr. MANN. Is it not the duty of the police everywhere to prevent the illicit sale of liquor?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; but we have those special officers that were appropriated for a year ago for the purpose of preventing the importation of liquor into the Indian country.

Mr. MANN. I can not understand the argument of the gentleman, that the Indian police have no duty at all in the way of inspection and prevention.

Mr. WEBB. Their duty ought to be to detect "bootleggers"; but their chief duty, as set forth in this bill, is to "maintain order," and when they find an Indian drunk they take charge of him and put him in the calaboose, or jail.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is not that keeping order? Mr. WEBB. I suppose the principal duty is to keep the Indians quiet after they become drunk; not for the purpose of detecting the violation of the law in regard to introducing and selling liquor in Indian country.

Mr. MANN. I suppose if they detected a drunken Indian,

that would be the best way to find out that there had been an

illicit sale of liquor.

Mr. WEBB. In possibly 9 cases out of 10 the poor Indian would not know the name of the man who sold him the liquor. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. In the hearings had upon the Indian appropriation bill, Mr. Meritt, who appeared before the committee, makes this answer to a question:

Mr. Meritt. It is one of the most important things in the Indian Service, that they be protected from liquor.

The Chairman. Then why not combine the two items?

Mr. Meritt. For the reason that we require all employees of the Indian Service to assist in this work, not only the Indian police, but superintendents and all employees of the Indian Service are expected to assist in preventing the sale of liquors to the Indian.

Mr. WERR. If that is the common that the Indian.

Mr. WEBB. If that is the case, why not appropriate \$100,000 to prevent the importation of liquor into the Indian country, or into the country adjacent to the Indian country, where the poor fellow can not get hold of it and be destroyed?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North

Carolina has expired.

Mr. WEBB. I ask for one more minute, Mr. Chairman.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Webb] asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBB. Last year, as I understand, the officers who drew this fund procured indictments to the extent that fines amounting to \$91,000 were imposed upon violators of this law against the importation of whisky into the Indian country, and that \$91,000 was turned into the Public Treasury.

Mr. MANN. Was it collected? Mr. WEBB. Of course.

Mr. MANN. Of course it was not.

Mr. WEBB. Of course it was collected. But whether that fund is self-sustaining or not, it is a bad place to begin economy. We can begin it somewhere else with a better effect and thus protect the morals and the very life of the Indian, and at the same time protect the law-abiding white men who live among the Indians. We owe it to this pitiful and rapidly disappearing race to protect them in every possible way from the ravages of whisky. I hope either my amendment or that of the gentle-man from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] will be adopted. Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for

the opinion of the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and I do not wish to disregard his request for any increased appropriation for this item without there being offered a better reason than has been offered by the chairman of the committee. The Committee on Indian Affairs was not able to find any evidence that would be a good or sufficient reason for decreasing this appropriation to \$75,000. A year ago, according to the report given in the hearings, \$94,964.29 was expended by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in suppressing the liquor traffic among the Indians. Some of the inspectors in charge of this work are, to my own personal knowledge, rendering excellent service in this work in some of the Western States. As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Webb] has remarked, "Prevention is the thing most desired in this matter." That can be accomplished best by the work of these inspectors. I am led to believe that the expenditures last year were not extravagant and unnecessary, and that the service needs every man now employed in this work, and that next year \$125,000 can be expended to very good advantage. So I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, raising the amount to \$125,000, will prevail.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina is mistaken about the purposes for which the Indian policemen are used. I can speak so far as my own State is concerned, because there is where I have had most opportunity to observe. One of their chief duties in the State of Oklahoma is to prevent the illicit sale of whisky to Indians, to prevent Indians getting possession of whisky. I do not think they have any jurisdiction, in Oklahoma at least, over any such misdemeanors as "drunk and disorderly." They ferret out whisky peddlers and bootleggers and give information to the proper authorities, so that they may be arrested and prosecuted. Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], in charge of this bill, gave one very potent reason why the appropriation for the suppression of the liquor traffic might be less expensive, and that is because many of the States in which the Indians reside are prohibition States. It should not take so many officers or so much expense to enforce the law in a prohibition State as it does in a State where they have the open saloon and the sale

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.
Mr. NORTON. Has the gentleman any facts or figures, or have any facts or figures been submitted to the committee, which the gentleman can base the statement that the amount being expended could be safely reduced? Is it not a fact that his statement to that effect is a mere gratuitous one, not based on any particular and definite information?

Mr. CARTER. No; my statement is not gratuitous. Certainly I would not say that the Indian Bureau should be held down too closely in the funds that are given them for the suppression of the liquor traffic; but my statement is based upon personal observation. Before we had statehood in Oklahoma the western half of it-Oklahoma Territory-was a wet country and whisky was sold all over it. I should say it took more money to suppress the liquor traffic among the Indians then on that side of the State and there was more drunkenness among the Indians than there is to-day. Since we have State-wide prohibition in Oklahoma, I think it should take less money today, and I know there is less drunkenness among the Indians than there was before we had prohibition on that side of the

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman know of a single case where an unnecessary expenditure has been made or where an unnecessary inspector has been employed in this service?

Mr. CARTER. I am not familiar with that. I could not say whether there is or not. I could not say whether they have too

Mr. NORTON. The expenditure provided for now exceeds

\$100,000 a year.

Mr. CARTER. No; they had \$100,000 last year. Mr. NORTON. The report indicates that the The report indicates that there are more

men to be employed next year.

Mr. CARTER. They had \$100,000 last year and spent \$94,000. Now, here is one thing that we must look to when we go to make an appropriation. It is just as well to be frank with the committee. The Indian Committee expects that it is going to have to agree to more than \$75,000 for the suppression of the liquor traffic among the Indians; and, so far as I am personally concerned, I have no expectation that we can avoid appropriating \$125,000 or \$150.000. I have no intention, so far as I am concerned, to try to hamper the Indian Service in the funds it should have for the suppression of the liquor traffic; but we all know what will be done to this item when it reaches another legislative body. I have no doubt in the world that when this bill comes back to the House it will contain an appropriation for ample funds, perhaps more than the commissioner asks for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Okla-

homa has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent for one minute

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that his time be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma question for information.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman can ask the question in my

Mr. MILLER. Has the gentleman any inside information which leads him to make the statement he has just made? inside information, I mean, has the gentleman any information as to what the other legislative body in the Capitol is likely to do with this item?

Mr. CARTER. Like Patrick Henry, I can only judge of the

future by the experience of the past.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman will be one of the conferees. Does the gentleman really think that this item will be increased to as much as \$125,000?

Mr. CARTER. I do not think there is a particle of doubt about it, and I do not think the gentleman has any doubt about it.

Oh, yes; I have.
AN. The time of the gentleman from Okla-The CHAIRMAN.

homa has again expired.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. Can the gentleman inform the committee how much this item was five years ago?

Mr. CARTER. I do not have that particular information at

Mr. MILLER. I can tell him. When I became a member of the committee the first year it was \$40,000. As the gentleman has correctly stated, prior to that it was more expensive to enforce the liquor traffic in regions where most of the Indians are than it has been since. Notwithstanding this, the Indian Committee of the House has always favored a reasonable appropriation and has enlarged it from year to year. Does the gentleman think the state of the liquor traffic in the United States to-day, having in mind what he has said about the ease with which it can be enforced and the dry territory being enlarged—does the gentleman think that the situation in the United States is such as to justify or require a marked increase in this appropriation?

Mr. CARTER. I think there is a much closer supervision of the Indian now than has been in the past in reference to the traffic in intoxicating liquor. I think more money is being spent and more effort is being made to keep whisky away from

the Indians than was formerly the case.

Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman favor any part of this money being spent to suppress the liquor traffic among the whites?

Mr. CARTER. I will let the white man answer that for himself. I would not take any part of it away from the Indian.

Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman think that any part of this appropriation made in this bill should be used to suppress liquor traffic among the whites?

Mr. CARTER. Not any that is appropriated in the Indian bill.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman from Oklahoma, among his other splendid attributes, is very artful in his answers. Does the gentleman think that this appropriation should be increased above \$100,000 to enable the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to possibly enforce prohibition in white territory?

Mr. CARTER. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a matter over which the Indian Committee has no jurisdiction, and the commissioner would not have supervision over the white man,

anyway.

Mr. MILLER. Would it be legal for the commissioner to

traffic among the whites?

Mr. CARTER. Oh, the gentleman is a so much better lawyer than I ever hope to be that I do not want him to ask me to give

him an expert legal opinion.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. With the permission of the gentleman from Oklahoma, I would like to say that I think they could expend some part of this appropriation in enforcing the law among the whites if it affected the Indians, which might be the case, even though it involved some white people.

Mr. MILLER. I think no one could controvert that proposi-

tion.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That answers the gentle-

man's question.

Mr. MILLER. No; my question is a little broader than that. Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman think that that would be a good thing in some parts of his district?

Mr. MILLER. Well, having regard to the distance my district is from South Dakota, I do not think there is any need of suppressing any evil that might crop up from the outside.

Mr. FALCONER. If the gentleman will yield, is it not true, as the gentleman from Oklahoma knows, that in suppressing the liquor traffic among the Indians the white man is nearly always involved? As a matter of fact, is not the money expended in keeping the white man, the bootlegger, from selling liquor to the Indians?

Mr. MILLER. That is suppressing liquor traffic among the Indians, and that is the special purpose, and what the money ought to be used for. That is the man who ought to be suppressed, the bootlegger, also the man that stands behind the bar and sells liquor to the Indians, be he white, brown, black,

or yellow.

Mr. CARTER. I understood the gentleman's question to be, Did I think any part of this money should be used to suppress the liquor traffic among the white people?

Mr. MILLER. That was exactly my question. Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Oklahoma in attempting to answer the gentleman from Minnesota fails to make one distinction. I would like to answer the question from my standpoint, that if liquor traffic among the whites was against the Federal law it would be the duty of Congress to appropriate money to prevent it and to enforce the law. That is all this does. Liquor traffic is unlawful among the Indians, and this appropriation is or ought to be for the purpose of enforcing the law.

Now, the gentleman from Oklohama [Mr. CARTER] made a very novel argument a moment ago, which I do not think I ever heard before on the floor of the House, intimating that an increase was after all desirable, but that this should go as it is in order to be used as trading stock when the bill gets into conference. I do not believe that this House, in reference to this item or any other item, should fail to put into the bill what the committee thinks ought to go in at the time the House deliberates on the question. If an increase is desirable, we ought to put it into the bill now, and I do believe it is desirable, because there is nothing that can be done for the benefit of the Indians of greater importance than the suppression of the liquor traffic among them.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Was not there more whisky sold among the Indians and more bootlegging done 11 or 15 years

ago than there is now?

Mr. LENROOT. I think that is true, but I undertake to say that if we should spend \$200,000 it would do the Indians more good in the use of that money now for the suppression of the liquor traffic among them than in expending millions for them in other ways

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman answer another question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We commenced with \$25,000, and the appropriation has grown from year to year until they want two or three hundred thousand dollars. Where will it end?

Mr. LENROOT. I hope it will end in the complete suppression of the liquor traffic among the Indians.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is the gentleman aware that a great many Indians have become citizens of the States and vote in prohibition States, and that we are fast eliminating the Indian question and driving out whisky among the Indians with the money that we are spending? It seems that the more we do the more we are asked to do.

Mr. LENROOT. I think not; but I wish to say just this, Mr. Chairman: This money is expended not in taking the place of Indian policemen, is not expended on reservations, but it is expended outside of the reservation in the detection of persons who sell the liquor. Arresting an Indian and fining or imprisoning him does little or nothing toward suppressing the liquor

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes. Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that, as usual, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Lenroot] is interested in this highly important subject. He has Indian reservations in his district, and it is an important matter to him. will ask the gentleman if the State of Wisconsin has laws prohibiting the sale of liquor to Indians?

Mr. LENROOT. I think not.
Mr. MILLER. The State of Minnesota has very strong laws, even stronger than the Federal law, and I was under the impression that Wisconsin had.

Mr. LENROOT. We rely entirely upon the Federal law.
Mr. MILLER. The point I was about to make is that every
time we enlarge this we in some way cause the States, respectively, to relinquish their activity in this regard, and that it would not be proper, in my judgment, to increase this to a point so that the State will say that the Federal Government is going to look after the whole thing.

Mr. LENROOT. I quite agree with the gentleman in that

regard.

Mr. MILLER. The only way that we can take care of the Indians in these matters is to have the active cooperation of the State governments, and that we have not had up to this

Mr. LENROOT. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of increasing this appropriation, and it is about the only appropriation that I know of that I am in favor of increasing. A few years ago we were making an appropriation, I think, of \$25,000, and doing the work very well. There was very little drunkenness among the Indians. We then increased it to \$50,000, then to \$75,000, and then to \$100,000, and now they want to increase it to \$125,000. While this has been going on various of the States have become prohibition States and have prohibited entirely the sale of liquor in those States, and then we passed the Webb law, which made it unlawful to take liquor into a State contrary to the law of the State. It seems that every move we make increases the need of appropriating money to enforce the nonsale of liquor to the Indians. I think we ought to prevent the sale of liquor to the Indians, yet Arizona has just gone dry, and we will need to expend more money next year in Arizona, where they can not have saloons, to prevent the sale of liquor to the Indians than we did last year when they did have saloons. That is no reflection upon the prohibition proposition, but it indicates, after all, that it is not so very easy by legislation to say that men shall not gratify their appetites if they have an opportunity. During this time we have dis-banded the Indians from tribes and have made them citizens, and as fast as we make them citizens, the prohibition against the sale of liquor to them still being in existence, we have to expend more money to keep them sober. I had supposed that citizenship had a sobering influence upon ordinary people, but it seems to have an inverse effect upon our Indian citizens, The faster they become citizens, the more we need to keep them in sober citizenship.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gen-

tleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say that the last statement of the gentleman is an accurate statement, that there is very little trouble in enforcing the law in what is known as a closed Indian reservation, and the fact that we are opening up Indian reservations and towns are being established and white people are moving in among the Indians makes it very much more difficult to enforce the law as to prohibition than when the reservations were closed. So the statement of the gentleman is borne out by the facts.

Mr. MANN. Of course, or I would not have made it; but it

having a law making it unlawful to take liquor into the States, require something more than law to enforce prohibition.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. I do not know what they do in the State of Arizona, but in the State of Washington the provision of the bill was to the effect that prohibition would go into effect January 1, 1916. This appropriation covers 1916, and the State of Washington during 1916 will be no drier than it was in 1914.

Mr. MANN. If it goes into effect the 1st of January, 1916,

why will it not be drier during that year?

Mr. FALCONER. It will after 1916, but we have all of 1915 to go through with it yet.

Mr. MANN. I did not refer to the State of Washington.

Mr. FALCONER. How about the State of Arizona?

Mr. MANN. Arizona is now dry, and the State of Washington will be dry theoretically from the 1st of January, 1916, and this bill covers the first six months of 1916.

Mr. FOWLER rose.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, before the gentle-man from Illinois proceeds I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the provision that it close as to all amendments, as I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he would not accept an amendment making it \$200,000 instead of \$100,000?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MANN. What is the request? The CHAIRMAN. That all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. I have an amendment that I desire to offer to the bill.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Washington desires to have five minutes

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I will make it 12 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that there is a marked degree of progression among the Indians. Many of them are becoming civilized and are given full citizenship in a measure equal to that of the white people. I have no doubt that where the suppression of intoxicating liquor is enforced the Indians have a much better opportunity for the purposes of improvement than in those localities where the suppression is not literally enforced. The environments of a man have much to do with his progress in life, and as long as the Indian is surrounded with these debauching environments he, like mankind everywhere, will become more or less contaminated by those influences. It is no argument, Mr. Chairman, to say because it takes money to enforce prohibition that prohibition laws are not desirable. If prohibition laws have a tendency to cleanse communities, if such laws give communities a better opportunity for a higher civilization, then they are to be encouraged, the same as other good laws. I understand that there remains only \$5,000 unexpended balance out of \$100,000 appropriated for this purpose in the last bill. That being true, Mr. Chairman, I take it that it will require as much money to enforce prohibition among the Indians as it has heretofore, and in order that the work may not be checked and halted, I think this House could do itself no greater honor than to appropriate enough money to see that the Indians are protected. Mr. Chairman, it is a common practice of gentlemen who are opposed to certain measures to urge a condition of expenditure which has resulted in more or less failure, just as these gentlemen who are opposed to prohibition are urging that the expenditure of money does not secure prohibition. Neither does the expenditure of money prohibit murder, robbery, and rape. You could just as well say that you ought not to appropriate money to punish those who commit such vile crimes as to say that you should not appropriate money to enforce pro-hibition laws. It is the certainty of the enforcement of the criminal law that gives society security and protection from the criminal. You can not carry out this law without appropriat-Mr. MANN. Of course, or I would not have made it; but it also shows that these States which declare for prohibition, even amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the

noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WEBB. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were-ayes 10, noes 23.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, as I understood it, the gentle-man from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] stated that he was willing to accept an amendment making the amount \$200,000.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.
Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman can not object.
The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the

noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. The committee divided; and there were-ayes 23, noes 12.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRYAN: Page 4, line 2, add the following: "The sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage within 25 miles of any Indian reservation is hereby prohibited. Any person violating this provision shall be subject to a fine of \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is new legislation, and therefore subject to a

point of order.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order for a moment under the agreement that I should have five

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will reserve the point of order

for five minutes.

While the point of order is being reserved I Mr. BRYAN. want to say just a word in reference to the point of order. From the argument of the gentleman from Illinois and from others here on the floor the expenditures of the Government for the suppression of the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians is being increased from day to day, and I understand under the Holman rule any amendment which tends to decrease an expenditure is in order. Now, the point may be somewhat speculative and quite untenable as a parliamentary argument, but the prohibiting of the sale of liquor within 25 miles of one of these Indian reservations would decrease the expenditure and the expenses of the Government in enforcing the law on the reservation.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BRYAN. Yes.
Mr. MURRAY. Does not the gentleman think it will cost more to enforce such a law within a zone of 25 miles of an

Indian reservation than without it?

Mr. BRYAN. We are only dealing with the cost on the reservation, not outside of the Indian reservation, and, Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman of this committee will not do as he suggests here and make a point of order against this, although it is new legislation and subject to the point. I think that the committee ought to be very glad, inasmuch as, in principle, I understand the Democratic Party and some gentlemen over there are dry, but only in vote on national prohibition are they otherwise.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. BRYAN. Yes. Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman think Congress, if it wanted to, has authority to say that a strip of territory 25 miles outside of a reservation in a State in which the laws permitted

the license of the liquor traffic should be dry?

Mr. BRYAN. I think the national sovereignty is sufficient to authorize us to protect our own reservations by creating an area about them where liquor can not be sold. We have the right to prohibit the sale of liquor within the reservations, and we have the right to prohibit it on the borders of the reservations

Mr. MANN. Make it a thousand miles away. Mr. BRYAN. Yes. I would like to make it within a thousand miles of the reservation. Let somebody move to amend it by making it a thousand miles. Let some of these "dry" men who vote against national prohibition do that; men who are so "dry" that you can burn them on the liquor proposition. [Laughter.] When you come in here with an amendment to wipe out the traffic in the entire country they vote "damp"; I will not say "wet." You can make it a thousand miles and

suit me that much better. This committee being an Indian Committee, and therefore a "dry" committee, it ought not to make a point of order against this amendment, and it ought to encourage us in protecting these reservations. At our military posts we have the right to create a dry area around the military posts in order to protect the military from the brothels and saloons that would gather around the posts, and I think this amendment goes to the very heart of the proposition.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to tht gentleman from Illinois? Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think the National Government has the authority to prohibit the sale of liquor near a

military post?

Mr. BRYAN. I would say "yes" to that.

Mr. MANN. I would like to know what the authority is.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman is a constitutional lawyer, and advocating a constitutional point has the burden placed upon him to present the constitutional authority.

Mr. MANN. It is certain that it can not be done except

through the State.

Mr. BRYAN. I think the gentleman is wrong about it. If we pass it here, I know—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman himself is a great constitutional

lawyer, and-

Mr. BRYAN. I know that if we pass it it will be constitutional, and if we pass it we shall be doing something substantial. I am absolutely safe in taking that position as to constitutionality, for the "if" is a very big "if" in this particular case.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington says that this Committee on Indian Affairs is a "dry"

committee. What authority has the gentleman for that state-

Mr. BRYAN. I will take as the latest test the roll call that

we had the other day.

We HARRISON. They have just brought in a bill that

reduces the amount to be expended for this service.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman ought to know whether his

colleagues are dry or wet.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] make the point of order?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

To relieve distress among Indians and to provide for their care and for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases, including the purchase of vaccine and expense of vaccination, maintenance of hospitals and sanatoriums, for incidental and all other expenses for their proper conduct and managements, including pay of employees, repairs, improvements, and for necessary expenses of transporting Indian patients to and from such hospitals and sanatoriums, and for the correction of sanitary defects in Indian homes, \$350,000: Provided, that not to exceed \$90,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended in the erection and equipment of new hospitals for the use of Indians; and no hospital shall be constructed at a cost to exceed \$15,000, including equipment: Provided further, That hereafter the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to Congress annually a detailed report as to all moneys expended in the erection and maintenance of hospitals and sanatoriums as provided for herein.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order

on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I

would like to offer,

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the committee a question? I notice in this appropriation of \$350,000 it is provided that \$90,000 of it is to be used for the erection and equipment of new hospitals for the use of the Indians. Where are the new hospitals to be located and used?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is subject to the discretion

of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indiau

Affairs

Mr. HARRISON. Do you propose to let him expend \$90,000

just where he wants to?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They asked for that amount, and it is impossible for us to determine in advance what reservations are needing those hospitals the worst. They are acting upon the intelligence and information which they get from the inspectors out in the field concerning the urgent need of the Indians.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the Commissioner of Indian Affairs say

he needed this money?

Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. HARRISON. He did He did not state where he intended to build the hospitals?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; that is not necessary. I think they have general supervision of the funds, and they will build the hospitals where they are most needed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order

on the paragraph.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] will not make a point of order on this paragraph. To my mind this is a very important provision for the Indians. It has been demonstrated time and time again by reports made by those in authority with reference to the Indians that they are suffering from tuberculosis, trachoma, and other diseases of a character that have depopulated them very much, and something of this kind is necessary.

For instance, take trachoma: It is so important that those persons suffering from this disease should be separated from those who are not afflicted with it that it is very necessary

that we should have some arrangement of this kind.

I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I do not believe that the discretion lodged with the department in this matter is being abused. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs is limited so that he can not establish and build and equip a hospital at an expense exceeding \$15,000. These patients with the peculiar disease I speak of, such as trachoma, which is infectious, are to be separated from the well persons. It is, to my mind, so important that if we must do anything for these Indians to prevent blindness and death among them, we ought to make some such provision.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the gentleman think that the

Commissioner of Indian Affairs ought, at least in his recommendation to the committee for this appropriation, state where he expects these hospitals to be built and where they are needed, so that the committee and the House may know about

the necessity?

Mr. FOSTER. That might be so, and yet I think that in a matter of this kind, where we have confidence in the Commissioner of Indian Affairs-which I believe we have-he should have the discretion of locating these hospitals, after an investi-

gation, where they will do the Indians the most good.

I remember when this item was up before that I took some little interest in it, because I believed it was one of the most important items in this bill then up for consideration. I submit to my friend from Mississippi that in view of the conditions that exist now among the Indians in reference to these particular diseases, such as trachoma and tuberculosis, in which the greatest care must be used if we are to stamp out those diseases and help the afflicted, we ought to have this appro-priation in the bill, permitting the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to establish these hospitals and conduct them in such a way that the patients may be properly treated. They can not get that treatment while they remain in their homes in the condition in which they are, and we can only provide it by removing the Indians from their present surroundings and placing them in hospitals, where they can receive proper treatment needed to stamp out the disease. You can not cure tra-choma in any other way. It requires the best care and sanitary conditions to save those people from becoming blind or from having diseased eyes as long as they live, and I suggest to my friend and earnestly beg of him that he withdraw the point of order from this provision and allow it to remain in the bill

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, as I remember it, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs brought in separate items for either two or three hospitals, and as to this item he asked for an appropriation of a less amount than we appropriated. My eyes

do not catch the amount just at this moment.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The sum of \$300,000 was estimated for, for relieving distress; \$100,000 for correcting sanitary defects in Indian homes, and then there was a specific appropriation for a hospital at Fort Lapwai, and for the Sac and Fox Agency in Iowa, and the committee consolidated all of those items, which were separately estimated for, and made an appropriation of \$300,000 in all.

Mr. CARTER. So that one hospital will be located at Fort Lapwai and the other at the Sac and Fox Agency. I take it the commissioner himself is not now able to locate the others. and he may not know where to locate all of them until condi-

tions arise in the future.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.
Mr. HARRISON. I notice in the report it says that the proposed hospital in the Choctaw Nation is to cost \$50,000. Is that one of them?

Mr. CARTER. The hospital in the Choctaw Nation in Oklahoma was built from tribal funds, and was appropriated for in the last appropriation. No part of this money goes to any part of Oklahoma.

That is not included in this \$90,000. Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. CARTER. None of it.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes. Mr. SISSON. How much of this money will be appropriated to sectarian institutions?

Mr. CARTER. None of it. Mr. SISSON. Of this lump sum of \$350,000?

Mr. CARTER. To relieve distress, do you mean?
Mr. SISSON. Yes.
Mr. CARTER. None of it goes to sectarian institutions.
Mr. SISSON. It says:

Maintenance of hospitals and sanatoriums, for incidental and all other expenses for their proper conduct and management, including pay of employees-

And so forth.

Does the gentleman know that none of these institutions are under sectarian control?

Mr. CARTER. I am confident that none of them are under sectarian control.

Mr. FOSTER. If the gentleman will permit, this refers to hospitals that have been established by the Government,

Mr. CARTER. That is true. We established several of them

last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Last year this item was under consideration and some of these hospitals were authorized. These are the institutions which are now being provided for, as I understand, this was the constitution of the constitutions which are now being provided for as I understand, the constitution of the consti in this bill, and this money goes to those hospitals that are so established.

Mr. SISSON. I have no objection to the gentleman's item, but I do not want any of these appropriations to be made for

the benefit of any school under sectarian control.

Mr. FOSTER. No part of the money will be so used.

Mr. CARTER. This does not go to a school. It goes for

hospitals.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman is absolutely sure that none of this money can or will be paid to any institution under sectarian control, I will not offer the amendment; but I intended to offer an amendment providing that none of this money should be paid to any institution under sectarian control.

Mr. CARTER. This money could not be paid to an institu-tion under sectarian control. It is—

To relieve distress among Indians and to provide for their care and for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases.

That is done entirely by the service. The only Indian institu-

tions operated by churches are schools.

Mr. SISSON. There is nothing in this bill, however, that

would prevent it, if we make the appropriation.

Mr. CARTER. I doubt if the comptroller would approve any voucher for that purpose.

Mr. SISSON. I will state frankly to the gentleman—Mr. CARTER. Let me answer the gentleman's question. doubt if the comptroller would approve of a voucher for an institution outside of the regular service, under this language.

If it appears on its face I am sure he could not Mr. SISSON. do it, because there is a statute providing that no money or property or anything of value shall be appropriated to sectarian institutions of any kind or character. The statute is very sweeping, but my information is that in the Indian appropriation bill somewhere there is perhaps an item under which some of the various churches are getting the benefit of some of the funds paid to the schools or to hospitals under their control, in

spite of that statute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want five minutes, Mr. HARRISON. We are discussing this under a point of order that has been reserved. There is no five-minute limitation on that.

Mr. CARTER. While not required by the rules, we some-

times discuss these points under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserved the point of order. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma ask for five minutes more?

Mr. CARTER. Yes. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. I want to state to the gentleman that I have no objection to his item, provided none of this money is to go to any institution under sectarian control.

Mr. CARTER. I can assure the gentleman that none of it

will go to such an institution.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Not only will none of it be so expended, but it can not be so expended under existing law. Not a dollar appropriated by the Indian appropriation bill can be so The only money that goes to sectarian institutions is money belonging to the Indians, which may be expended as they desire; money that is due them, that they personally may direct the use of, for the education of their children in sectarian schools. No money appropriated from the Public Treasury can be so used except in fulfillment of a treaty.

Mr. SISSON. With the further permission of the gentleman from Oklahoma, in order that we may get at the truth, as I understand, some of the Indian tribes made treaties a number of years ago with churches in relation to payment out of

tribal funds. A statute was passed in 1896-

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to say to the gentle-man that I think he is mistaken in assuming that there were any treaties between Indians and any churches. The gentle-man is mistaken in that assumption. There is a law that pro-vides that no money appropriated out of the Treasury as a gratuity can be used in the support or maintenance of sectarian schools.

Mr. SISSON. I am thoroughly familiar with that statute.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say that the only money that is used, and that is in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court, is money in the Treasury belonging to the Indians under some treaty or agreement. If an individual Indian elects to take his share of that money and use it to support his child in a sectarian school, he can do it the same as the gentleman from Mississippi or I could do if we wanted to educate our child in a sectarian school.

Mr. SISSON. In the debate some years ago, in reference to the passage of this statute which the gentleman speaks of, there was something said about treaties made a number of years ago, when the Indians had tribal governments out in the Dakotas and in Oregon and Montana where they made arrangements with certain churches-Methodist, Episcopal, and Catholic Churches-to establish certain institutions to which tribes were

to pay so much for the education of their children.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. There may have been some such discussion at the time the legislation was passed prohibiting the use of public money in supporting sectarian schools, but it may have been provided that it would not take effect until some time in the future, in order that it would not interfere with existing contracts.

Mr. SISSON. Is the gentleman sure that the contracts or treaties with the Indians have expired?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I do not know anything about any treaties or agreements between the Indians, but I do know that there are no Indian tribes that pay this money; it is simply individual Indians that have a share in the funds.

Mr. SISSON. Does the gentleman know how much is paid out of the Indian funds to religious institutions?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I do not recall the amount, but my recollection is that it appears in the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, showing how much and where it is paid. If not in the last report, I am sure it appears in some of the reports made heretofore.

Mr. MANN. I think the only committee of the House that reports on the appropriation of money to be paid to sectarian institutions is the committee of which the gentleman from Mississippi is a member; and, if I recoilect right, he is a member of the subcommittee that reports the bill that does it.

Mr. SISSON. I am conscious of that fact, and I have attacked these items as vigorously as I could and tried to get a

full investigation.

Mr. MANN. There is no other committee that reports it. Mr. SISSON. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. MANN. I am. Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foster] may give expert testimony on this item because he is a doctor, but at that he has only faintly described the deplorable health condition of the Indians. I have traveled over several Indian reservations, and it has been my privilege to make some close observations of these matters. I am sure their state of health is more deplorable than even my good friend from Illinois has surmised. Most of us are aware that the Indians' worst afflictions are tuberculosis and trachoma. Many of them live in miserably bad ventilated log cabins with nothing but mother earth for a floor, and it is a waste of time to discuss the conduciveness of such conditions to these two dread diseases.

Last fall I was traveling over an Indian reservation with a United States Senator, and we came to an Indian school. As we went into the superintendent's house we left him engaged in conversation with an Indian outside, and when he came in the

Senator said, "What were you talking to that fellow about?" The superintendent said, "He brought a child to school which has trachoma." "What did you do about it," the Senator inquired. The superintendent replied, "Sent her back home." quired. The superintendent replied, "Sent her back home." Then the Senator asked, "How many other children has he?" "Two at home and one in school," replied the superintendent. "So," said the Senator, "you have sent this child back to infect the other children, the father and mother, and probably many others on the reservation. Why did you not keep her here?" The superintendent answered, "Because we have no been the control of the contro hospital."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think all medical authorities agree that the best way to cure this disease of trachoma, so prevalent among the Indians, and to keep the infection from spreading is by segregation. How are you going to segregate without proper hospital facilities? If you have a hospital, you may segregate trachoma at certain stages and effect a permanent cure. Even tuberculosis may be cured in its primary stages and relief given to patients in advanced cases if you have hospitals properly located. But without hospitals any cure or even improvement in the health condition of the Indian, so far as these two diseases are concerned, is absolutely impossible. Without hospitals you are forced to send the infected person back upon the reservation into the badly ventilated, crowded log cabin to infect his sisters, brothers, mother, father, children, and, in fact, all other members of the tribe. If there is any matter which is important, it is the health of the individual, and if there is any necessity which is urgent it is that for hospitals on or near the different reservations, where these two maladies can be properly treated and alleviated. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not insist upon his point of order to strike this hospital item out, thereby leaving the afflicted Indian in the deplorable condition where he can not be segregated, but must die of tuberculosis or become blind from trachoma.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I notice that in 1914 the appropriation was \$200,000, and there was an unexpended balance The current appropriation is \$300,000. gentleman any information or was any given to the committee as to the probability of this money being expended, or will there be a relatively large unexpended balance for the fiscal year of 1915?

Mr. CARTER. The committee has reported \$165,000, all told, less than that requested by the department. As has been stated by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Burke], several other items for the health of the Indians were eliminated and all items for the care of their health were consolidated in

this one item.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It was \$200,000 in 1914. Mr. CARTER. Prior to this time other items had been carried in other parts of the bill, which have been eliminated.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Does that account for the increase from \$200,000 to \$300,000?

Mr. CARTER. Yes,

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I call attention to the fact that under the appropriation for the present year six hospitals are being constructed and will be ready for occupancy in July next of the fiscal year, and that that will involve an expense that we did not have last year.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will permit, for the purpose of constructing these hospitals this amount was increased in the current law-the year 1915-from \$200,000

to \$300,000?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It certainly was; yes. Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In the present bill you increase that amount still \$50,000 more?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman permit me to explain that? On line 12, page 4, he will see an item for the correction of sanitary defects in Indian homes——
Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The committee had an esti-

mate of \$100,000, and also a specific appropriation for two hospitals, which was not included in the estimate. That refersto this.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Then it was a consolidation of appropriations rather than an increase for the purpose of constructing hospitals?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Not at all. It was a decrease from the estimates, giving them the same amount they had last year, assuming that they would erect six additional hospitals costing not to exceed \$15,000 each.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The purpose of the current law is to erect these other hospitals at a cost of \$15,000 each?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is the intention.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I am merely asking for in-

formation and had no other purpose in mind.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that there were eliminated from this bill in other items \$40,000 for a hospital at Lapwai, \$20,000 for a Sac and Fox hospital, and \$100,000 for correcting sanitary defects, which makes, in all, \$165,000.

Mr. MANN. They eliminated them from the estimates, but

not from the appropriations.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I was about to ask that question-if that elimination were not made from the estimates and not from former appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. From the estimates; in the bill submitted by

the department.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. This is an increase of \$100,000 over the appropriation for the year 1914?

Mr. CARTER. Fifty thousand dollars in this item. Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. Does the gentleman from Mississippi insist upon his point of order?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he knows whether or not this fund is reimbursable?

Mr. FOSTER. I think not. Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman think it ought to be reimbursable?

Mr. FOSTER. My judgment is that those Indians—Mr. HARRISON. Where they are able?
Mr. FOSTER. Where they are able, it might properly be done.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to that part of the paragraph, lines 13 to 17, as follows:

Provided, That not to exceed \$90,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended in the erection and equipment of new hospitals for the use of Indians; and no hospital shall be constructed at a cost to exceed \$15,000, including equipment.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman wants to strike out the hospitals?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. The reason why I make this point of order is because I believe it is a bad precedent to establish for any bureau to be given that broad discretion, to spend money even to the amount of \$90,000, without first furnishing to the House facts that will warrant the expenditure and at least an idea where they expect to build these hospitals and how,

and so forth. Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this is subject to a point of order, for the reason that it limits the amount carried here. It is for \$350,000, and this

only designates how it shall be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman furnish the Chair any law which authorizes the erection of these hospitals?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Only in the general Indian law. Anything that is necessary for the purpose of their protection and welfare would come under the general provisions of the original law creating the Indian Bureau, and I think one of the most essential features of the bill is that we shall protect the health of these Indians by these small hospitals. We guard it carefully in line 17 by stating that they shall be constructed at a cost of not to exceed \$15,000 each. There is no question but that we can build hospitals for the purpose of protecting them from diseases and providing for their health and comfort, but we limit it in line 17 to a cost of \$15,000 each.

The CHAIRMAN The Chair does not record the

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not regard this proviso as a limitation on the appropriation, because it specifically authorizes the erection of new hospitals at a cost of not to exceed

\$15,000 each.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is a limitation on the amount that we propose to give in gross. It is \$90,000, and we are apportioning out the \$90,000 so as to build six hospitals at \$15,000 each.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I submit to -the Chair that the general language of the law that has been cited by the gentleman from Texas would not give them authority, without specific authority of law, to construct hospitals, To my mind the language is clearly subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that it is subject to the point of order. It is new legislation. The point of order is

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 13, strike out the figures "\$350,000" and insert the fig-es "\$300,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr.

Page of North Carolina) there were—ayes 8, noes 14.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by adding, after the word "herein," in line 21, the following: "Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior may employ to aid in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph physicians who have not a civil-service status."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve a

point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman send up his amendment?-which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 21, after the word "herein." insert the following: "Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior may employ to aid in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph physicians who have not a civil-service status."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.
Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Would the gentleman object to
adding the words "in his discretion" after the word "may"?
Mr. MILLER. I think the word "may" includes, with the
following words, "in his discretion," but I have no objection to including them.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would like to have that language added, if the gentleman has no objection.

Mr. MILLER. I will accept the proposed amendment. The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will be allowed to modify his amendment.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment by inserting, after the word "may," in the first line, the words "in his discretion," so that the amendment as amended will read: "Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion," etc.

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in order that I may have an expression from the members of the committee whether they really want to help the Indians. That is all this amounts to. You can appropriate all the money in the United States Treasury to suppress trachoma and tuberculosis among the Indians in the United States and at the same time tie the hands of the administrative officer to spend the money only by utilizing the services of civil-service hired doctors and you will not have gained a single step of advantage. I think that is a pretty fairly strong statement to make. I do not know but if I had more emphatic language at my command I would use that. I do not know what the attitude of the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs is upon this question, because I have never discussed it with him. I know what the attitude of other administrative officers has been in times past on this proposition. I know the evidence of my own eyes, I have seen on many, many reservations throughout the United States evidence that is not open to doubt, not capable of unbelief. As I have stated before on other occasions, I now repeat, the civil-service process secures for the Indian Service physicians of one of two classes. Either young men just graduated from college, without training and experience and who are not at all qualified to handle the highly specialized work of combating trachoma and tuberculosis, or men who have been out of college a reasonable length of time and made a failure in their practice. A man of professional education and standing who has made a failure of his practice and who has not been able to earn a livelihood practicing his profession during a period of years in a community is not fit to spend this money and get a salary from the United States, at the same time working havoc among the Indians.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield

for a question? Mr. MILLER.

Certainly. Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the Indian Office finds it needs a physician and advertises for bids for physicians to look after the sick Indians and announces it will not pay more than \$760 per annum, what kind of a doctor do you expect to get for that sum?

Mr. MILLER. We can not expect to get any kind of a doctor, and this is as far as they can go now under civil-service rules, only it is \$720 instead of \$760. This is the limit of the amount that can be paid except to a physician secured from the civil service. This is the kind of doctors they are getting, and I know whereof I speak. It is just the kind of doctors who will spend your \$350,000, and I know whereof I speak. You can not get physicians for \$720 a year, nor can you get a man fit to do this work for \$1,000 a year or \$1,400, the practical maximum under the civil service. Think of hiring a physician capable of entering upon this grand humanitarian work and going out among the Indians and working for their welfare, as we desire this money shall be expended, for \$1,000 a year or \$720 a year! You can not get them and you can never deceive yourself into thinking you can get them. I know the Civil Service Commission will write and request that this amendment be stricken out if we adopt it; but are you trying to protect the Civil Service Commission in having a complete control of all branches of your Government, or are you really trying to help the Indians? You can not do both.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MILLER. I would like to have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota. [After a pause.] The Chair hears

Mr. MILLER. I have seen many and many a young man go out among the Indians and then remain a short time in a posi-tion he did not like, ask for a chance to be transferred, and leave, and all the period of time that was spent there was absolutely wasted, because he did nothing for the Indians except draw his salary. I have seen other physicians of middle life, of middle age. I have watched their work, and I knew that they were a failure in their profession because they made a failure of their work there. I have seen Indians moving along with legs broken and twisted, growing in an inhuman and grotesque fashion, and a physician sitting down who would not so much as bandage them up. That is the class of men you get and that is the class of men you will continue to get until you permit the Secretary of the Interior to go out and make contracts with reputable physicians who are capable of handling this great scourge. Oh, every once in awhile you can lift your hands in horror and get on your knees and you can lift your hands in horror and get on your knees and pray, if you want to, that the terrible scourge of tuberculosis and trachoma will flee from the Indian, and then you come in here and tie the hands of your administrative officials so as to make it possible for the ravages of these diseases to continue. [Applause. 1

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the debate be limited to five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been reserved on this amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] made the point of order. Mr. MANN. I reserved it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I indorse the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] in reference to the medical treatment that the Indians receive.

I was very much in hopes that when these hospitals were established the care and treatment of the Indian would be improved. It is true, as stated by the gentleman from Minnesota, that you can not get a physician, unless it is some young man just starting into practice and wants a little experience, to go out and take charge of one of those places, or else some one who has been a failure in the practice. I hope the time will come when the medical department of the Indian Service will be transferred to the Public Health Service, where I have always believed it ought to be. To-day we have scattered through different departments of our Government a lot of medical services that ought to be placed under the control of the Public Health Service. I do not mean by that that we should establish a great public health service, but I do believe you would get better work and better service if it were placed in the hands of that particular bureau which is looking after that kind of work all the time.

The Indian Commissioner, of course, is limited in the amount of money that he can pay to these physicians, and if this restriction is taken away, as the gentleman says, it will permit him to employ men who will be able to give better service.

Where is the limitation?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the amount that he can pay under the civil service. I understood that from the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MANN. You should not take all the gentleman's statements seriously.

Mr. FOSTER. If the present law fixes the amount that can be paid for these physicians-

Mr. MANN. The law does not fix it.

Mr. MILLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The law does fix it. Fourteen hundred dollars is the maximum that can be paid in the Indian Service for a physician.

Mr. MANN. There is no such law.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my colleague is right in the statement that there is no such law as fixes the salary of these physicians.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman that I think it is a regulation of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the department could get physicians at a price commensurate with the service they render. As it is now, no physician wants to go out there and work for \$60 a month any more than a lawyer would go out and look after the legal affairs of the Indians at \$60 a month. Let us have a better service, and let us give these Indians better medical treatment than they have been having in the past. I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. I am willing to try it. I do not believe it is possible to make the conditions any worse than they are how, and perhaps if we try it we will find that the conditions will be improved.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], who is so very extreme in his statements that he destroys the efficacy of them very often, proposes an amendment to the effect that these physicians shall not be under the civil service. Why, all the Government officials except those in the military service are under the civil service, and the term which my friend uses is not known in the law, carrying the meaning with which he inserts it in his amendment. If they were not under the civil service, they would be under the Army service

or the Navy service.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Yes; for information. Mr. MANN.

Mr. MILLER. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Well, make it short.

Mr. MILLER. Is not the language "a civil-service status" of common understanding and knowledge and acceptation?

Mr. MANN. It is frequently used by gentlemen not familiar with the law, but it is not used in the statutes. This is a proposition to insert it in the statutes, that these people shall not have a civil-service status, when that is the only status they

could have except a military status.

However, I know what the gentleman wants to get at. He wants to provide that they shall not be appointed from the eligible list under the civil-service law. That is a matter now resting in the hands of the President. The department can ask the President any day to take these employees out from the classified service. That is the proper term. Then they can be appointed as they please. The only limitation on the department now is the order of the President putting them in the classified service and the amount of the appropriations. They can pay a man \$100,000 a year, so far as the law is concerned. Of course they would not do it.

Now, the gentleman from Minnesota thinks the only kind of physicians they get at this salary is either young men just out of college or men who have made a failure of the practice of medicine, and my friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. Fos-TEB] suggests that it would be better if the Indians could be turned into the hospitals and there receive treatment. Who is it that takes care of patients in the hospitals? The internes and the nurses—both classes being there to learn, and practically without salaries. Who does the most of the work in the hospital? If these Indians were put in the hospitals, in the ordinary hospitals, they would receive their treatment from the interne, who was receiving no salary, or practically no salary, and from the nurse, who is receiving no salary, but who is learning the business.

Mr. MILLER. How many internes or nurses would the gentleman expect there would be in a hospital costing \$15,000 for construction and equipment? The gentleman knows there would be no internes and that most of the work would be done

by the physician himself.

Mr. MANN. I do not know how many internes there would be in those hospitals, but in the great hospitals throughout the country, where patients receive much better treatment than they would receive in these Indian hospitals, the patients receive their care and treatment from the internes, and when these internes have had their training in the hospitals they go out into the practice. So far as I am concerned, I would rather trust them than trust an old practicing physician who has forgotten most of what he learned in his youth and has not kept himself up to date.

It does not require a great amount of knowledge to treat tuberculosis. The gentleman says it requires a great physician to treat it. The treatment is well enough known not to require the administration of a physician at all. It is necessary to have some one to make the people afflicted take the treatment prescribed. I do not think it is the duty of Congress to interfere in this matter. If the department wishes to take physiclans outside of the classified service, all that is needed is to recommend that to the President with sufficient force and the President under the law has the power to do it.

Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman think the President would take such action?

Mr. MANN. I believe he would if the gentleman's statement were correct.

Mr. MILLER. There is no question about the correctness of the statement.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman makes very extreme statements sometimes.

Mr. MILLER. This is an extreme case.

Mr. MANN. Of course I know the gentleman thinks that is so, but the gentleman makes some statements that are so extreme that I am satisfied they are beyond the verities, and I think some of his other statements are also in error.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman must recognize that there are some things beyond the experience of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman always runs into that, and I do not pretend to know as much about Indian affairs as the gentleman from Minnesota does, yet only a moment ago the gentleman insisted that there was a law regulating the salaries of physicians. I challenge that statement. I should like to see him produce the law.

Mr. MILLER. I will produce the law, or a rule which has

the force of law.

Mr. MANN. A rule which can be changed to-morrow is not law. If the department wants to change the rule, they can change it. Give the department the reasons, and they probably

will change it

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman will yield again, I will say that I have had this up with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs many times, and upon investigation he has always told me that he did not have the authority; that he was compelled by law to restrict the appointment to these classes, as I have indicated. I also had it up with the Civil Service Commission at one time,

and they refused to acquiesce in the recommendation.

Mr. MANN. The Civil Service Commission are not the judges. The President is the judge. Let the Indian Department take it to the President. The President will want to do what is right and fair about it, and if such a state of facts exists as my friend from Minnesota thinks, I believe the President will take action. But if my friend from Minnesota is overzealous, perhaps the President will not agree with him. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment is open

to the objection of being legislation, and the point of order is

sustained.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have a statement prepared by the Indian Office giving a description of the hospitals that are being erected upon Indian reservations which I wish to read, which is as follows:

The hospitals selected to comply with the provisions of the current appropriation act for the construction of hospitals to cost not more \$15,000 each are of simple but substantial frame construction, of the pavilion type, with a two-story central building, flanked by one-story wings.

pavilion type, with a two-story central building, flanked by one-story wings.

On the first floor of the central portion are located the dining room and kitchen, the latter being provided with a screened porch and refrigerator room.

On the second floor are located four employees' rooms, a bathroom, and a closet for each employee's room.

In the wings are located sitting, locker, bath, and toilet rooms, and two wards, with a capacity of 30 patients, which capacity may be increased to 38 by utilizing open porches located at the front of the sitting rooms. The front wall of each sitting room is provided with glazed and screened windows in box frames, taking up practically the entire front-wall space.

The wards are of the open pattern and all walls are provided with screened and glazed triple-sliding sash and screened and glazed transoms.

A steam-heating equipment is provided for each hemital all the contraction of the steam-heating equipment is provided for each hemital all the contraction of the steam-heating equipment is provided for each hemital all the contraction of the steam-heating equipment is provided for each hemital all the contraction of the steam-heating equipment is provided for each hemital all the contraction of the steam-heating equipment is provided for each hemital all the contraction of the steam of t

A steam-heating equipment is provided for each hospital, also drainage and lighting systems.

The capacity of the proposed hospital in the Choctaw Nation, Okla., to cost \$50,000, is 80 patients, 20 of whom are to be placed in tent

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "further," in line 17, on page 4, after the word "Provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 17, after the word "Provided," strike out the word "further."

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 13, after the figures "350,000," insert the following: "Provided, That where any Indian tribe has to its credit funds in the Treasury of the United States, the amounts so expended herefor shall be reimbursable therefrom."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I make a point of order against that amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. What is the point of order?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is new legislation on an ap-

propriation bill.

Mr. HARRISON. It seems to me this amendment is in the interest of economy. It will make a saving and a reduction of expenditure. It is a retrenchment, because if this money, amounting to \$350,000, is expended and these Indian tribes have funds in the Treasury of the United States to their credit, they must reimburse the United States Treasury for the expenditure here made, and there will be that much saved to the Treasury of the Government. It seems to me that the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will

read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

For support of Indian day and industrial schools not otherwise provided for and for other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith, including the support and education of deaf and dumb and blind Indian children not to exceed \$40,000, \$1,440,000: Provided. That no part of this appropriation, or any other appropriation provided for herein, except appropriations made pursuant to treaties, shall be used to educate children of less than one-fourth Indian blood whose parents are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they live and where there are adequate free-school facilities provided and the facilities of the Indian schools are needed for pupils of more than one-fourth Indian blood: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the support of Indian day and industrial schools where specific appropriation is made: Provided further, That not more than \$50,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for the tuition of Indian children enrolled in the public schools.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I should like to know the object of restricting the appropriation for tuition in public schools, limiting it to \$50,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman refers to the pro-

vision in lines 12 to 14, on page 5?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It provides that not more than \$50,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for the tuition of Indian children enrolled in the public schools. That is an increase over the amount appropriated last year.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I understand that it is the disposition of the committee to favor increasing the education of Indian children in the public schools, rather than transporting them to distant parts of the country to be educated.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is the idea, to educate the children on the reservations.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. So this is an increase and not decrease'

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. It is an increase from \$20,000 to \$50,000-a \$30,000 increase.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman think that is enough?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is enough for experimental purposes. So far the matter is in the experimental stage, and it

has worked well as far as it has gone.

Mr. FERRIS. The Indians usually allot their lands up and down creeks and streams, seeking to get bottom land and tim-ber, which are considered more desirable for the Indians. There are some neighborhoods where the land is practically all allotted, and there is not enough taxable land to pay for conducting public schools at all. Often the white children have to pay tuition in addition to the regular school tax. Then and in that event, where Indian children can not be sent away-and often it is not best to send them away-it would seem to me that the commissioner ought to have a larger sum than that to help carry along the schools.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is in the experimental stage. Mr. FERRIS. If the Indian Commissioner and the Committee on Indian Affairs think this all that is necessary, of course

I am willing to trust their judgment.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I should like to say that the comptroller has held that no part of the money that we are proposing to appropriate can be used to pay for the tuition of any child who is under the law of the State in which he resides permitted to attend the public schools, and that it can only be used for paying the tuition of such Indian children as may belong to some tribe where the parents have not received their allotments or are not citizens of the United States and not taxpayers. I have in my hand an opinion rendered by the Comptroller of the Treasury in which he so decides, and I thought perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma would be interested in knowing about it, and that no part of this appropriation can be used to pay the tuition of Indian children who can be ad-

mitted to public schools.

Mr. FERRIS. I was not aware of that decision mentioned by the gentleman from South Dakota; but, if that is true, not penny of this appropriation can be used in my State. statute admitting my State to the Union provided that all full citizens could exercise every function of a citizen. This would be of no help to us at all. It would seem to me that this pro-This would vision ought to be broadened so as to authorize or allow the commissioner to expend some of the fund in meritorious cases. For instance, there is a tribe of Indians in Oklahoma that have allotted money on deposit, and who really have more money than the white settlers. They live in an allotted community where they have allotted lands up and down the stream and do not have any taxable property to maintain any school. The children who do not go to tribal schools away from home do not get any education at all.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I want to ask the gentleman if children who are allowed to attend the public schools are not

allowed tuition out of this appropriation?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say that it came to my notice that the comptroller made this decision, and I wrote to the Indian Office to know what State there was that had a law prohibiting Indian children from attending the public schools, and in his reply he says:

and in his reply he says:

You also request to be advised if in any State children of Indian citizens are prohibited from attending public schools. Attorney General D. M. Kelly, of Montana, in his letter to the office of February 21, 1914, quotes the law of Montana as follows:

"All school moneys apportioned by county superintendents of common schools shall be apportioned to the several districts in proportion to the number of school census children between six and twenty-one years of age, as shown by the returns of the district clerk for the next preceding school census: Provided, That Indian children, who are not living under the guardianship of white persons, shall not be included in the apportionment list unless the parents thereof are citizens of the United States or have taken land under the allotment and severalty act of Congress and have severed their tribal relations."

**After discussing this law he concludes his letter as follows:

After discussing this law he concludes his letter as follows:

"It occurs to me that, in view of the Federal legislation upon the subject (Secs. 2071 et seq. Rev. Stat. of the U. S.), it was never intended to impose upon the State the burden of educating Indians so long as they remained wards of the general Government, hence I conclude that only such Indians as have the status of those mentioned in our school law, supra, may be enrolled as students in our public schools." As far as the office is aware, Montana is the only State that has questioned the right of children of citizen Indians to attend public schools on the same terms as white children.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. And receive a portion of this

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes. Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Th

The children of an Indian who is a citizen can go to a public school, and they receive tuition from the appropriation carried in this bill.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is what the comptroller says, that Montana is the only State that has questioned the right of Indians to attend school on the same terms as white children

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to ask the gentleman from South Dakota a question. Is there anywhere in this bill an item appropriating money for the education of Indians in the public schools or common schools of any State?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes; there is an item that appropriates money for public schools in the State of Oklahoma of, I think, \$275,000. It has been carried in the bill for

a number of years

Mr. HARRISON. That is out of the funds of the Indian

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. No; that is an appropriation made from the General Treasury, the same as what is appropriated by the item in the bill now being considered.

Mr. HARRISON. That is the only instance?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is the only one I recall.
Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman think that money
ought to be appropriated out of the Federal Treasury to assist the common schools of any State?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is a question that I

do not care to discuss at this time.

Mr. MANN. We tried to knock it out a number of years ago,

but the gentleman from Mississippi voted for it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. The tribe of Indians living in my own State are not taxpayers. That is, their lands are not taxed under the laws of the State; they are still held in trust

by the Government. The schools on the reservation are maintained and paid for by white people who have bought Indian lands. So the whole burden of the support of the public schools rests on the white people. There is a provision no doubt somewhere in the bill providing for the payment of tuition of Indian children that attend these public schools. The tuition rate is very small and does not begin to pay the pro rata share of the Indian of the cost of his schooling, but some way and somehow the Indian Department is able to pay the tuition of the Indian children who attend the public schools supported entirely by the white people, and it is proper that the bill should carry an appropriation for the education of Indian children in the public schools where the Indian pays no tax.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this item of \$1,440,000 for the support of the Indian day and industrial schools presents an interesting proposition. Under the act of March 3, 1887, the Secretary of the Interior is required to make annually a report of the expenditures of this money, and this year he has made such a report, found in House Document 1285, submitted to the House on December 7. I find from that report, for instance, and the report is required to give the manner and for what purposes the general educational fund for the preceding fiscal year has been expended, the number and kind of schoolhouses erected, their cost, as well as the cost of repairs, the names of every teacher employed and compensation allowed, the location of each school, and the average attendance of each school.

I find, for instance, that at the Camp Verde day school, lo-

cated at Camp Verde, Ariz., the average attendance of pupils was 25; that Mary Noyes is the name of the teacher, who receives a salary of \$720 a year, while the total expenses of the school amounted to \$2,871.95.

The teacher of these few pupils receives a salary of \$721 a year, but where the rest of the \$2.871.95 goes I do not know. It looks like a rather large sum for the expenses of the school— for janitor service, fuel, light, heating, and anything else of that sort. At the Canyon Day School, at Fort Apache, there are 38 pupils in attendance. Mr. Schriver is the teacher, at a salary of \$780, and yet the total expense of this Fort Apache day school is \$4,206.58. At the Havasupai Day School, at Supai, Ariz., there are 32 pupils in average daily attendance, and Miss West, the teacher, receives a salary of \$720. Yet while the total expense of that school is \$3,655.72, the teacher gets but \$720. I might go through the whole list of these, but I will not take the time to do so. I desire, however, to call attention to the one which I think takes the cake. That is the Soboba School, at San Jacinto, Cal. There is an average daily attendance there of 10 pupils, and Miss May Stanley, teacher, receives a salary of \$900 a year for teaching that school. The total expense of the school is \$8,995.25.

Mr. GARNER. How much per student?

Mr. MANN. A little over \$800 per student. Of course it would be far cheaper to pick up these Indians and send them to Harvard or Vassar. I would like to have some distinguished member of the Committee on Indian Affairs who knows all about this explain just what this money is expended for. Of course I suppose there is some explanation,
Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What case is that?
Mr. MANN. The Soboba Day School.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Of course all of the information I have is the information contained in the report of the Secretary of the Interior, which is supposed to give accurately the expenses of

these schools paid out of this appropriation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. On page 8 the gentleman will find the item. Five thousand five hundred and eighty-seven

dollars are paid out for wages and salaries.

Mr. MANN. Yes. I will read the items, if that will satisfy the gentleman. In salaries, wages, and so forth, at this school the amount paid out is \$5.587.66. What the "etc." is, I do not know. Does the gentleman? For traveling expenses, \$318.60; for heat, light, and power services, \$253.73; for communication service, \$30.50; for subsistence, supplies, \$265.71; for dry goods, wearing apparel, and so forth, \$38.97; for forage—forage for pupils!—\$76.94; for fuel, illuminants, lubricants, and so forth, \$549.07; for educational supplies, they do cants, and so forth, \$549.07; for educational supplies—they do not require much for educational supplies—\$15.68 [laughter]; for equipment, material, and so forth, \$1.340.31; and for miscellaneous, \$49.96, making a total of \$8,995.25. And it is paid out of this appropriation for support of day and industrial schools.

Mr. GARNER. Is that appropriation made in a lump sum?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Who is responsible for the appropriation of

this lump sum?

Mr. MANN. I do not know who is responsible, and I do not say that there is no explanation of this; but it certainly is not given in the annual report which the Secretary is required to make and does make to Congress.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This is an industrial school.

Ten pupils at an industrial school at a total Mr. MANN. cost of \$8,995.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is just being started.
Mr. MANN. Would it not be better to close it up? Since when did it become profitable for us, if the gentleman be correct, and I doubt that, to maintain an industrial school for 10 pupils at an expense of \$9,000 a year? I say that probably they can make an explanation, but if it be the fact, as is suggested by the gentleman from Texas in charge of the bill, that they are paying \$9,000 a year for teaching 10 pupils in an industrial school, then they better shift them somewhere else and provide for better education. Here is a lump-sum appro-That is one thing. There are a whole lot of these items in this report. I have read only four of them, although I think possibly I have read the one that is the most striking.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Considering the statement the gentleman has Just made with reference to one school, would not the Congress be safe in reducing this appropriation \$100,000, and seeing if they can not take care of it a little more economically?

Mr. MANN. I do not undertake to say that. I do not draw my conclusions simply by reading a part of a thing until I get the full information. I do not know whether the committee would have full information in reference to this, but this is all of the information that I get from the report, and I think possibly that even calling attention to it in this way will provide further information in the future, so that we will know more about it; but I am sure that Mr. Secretary Lane would not for a moment think of maintaining an industrial school at an expense of \$9,000 a year to take care of 10 pupils.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to correct the statement I made a moment ago, and I would like the attention of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris]. I called the gentleman's attention to a decision of the comptroller and stated the substance of it, basing what I said upon the statement made in the report of the commissioner for the last fiscal year, on page 6, as

Until recently the office paid tuition in order to procure the enrollment of Indian children in public schools where their parents were not taxpayers. It became necessary to modify this plan, however, for the Comptroller of the Treasury, in a decision of October 22, 1913, ruled that the Federal Government was not authorized to pay tuition of Indian children legally entitled to attend the State public schools.

When I made the statement that I did and quoted from the commissioner's letter, I had not finished the reading of the letter which had just been handed to me. Since making the statement I have read the letter in full, and I now wish to read from it as follows:

I have read the letter in full, and I now wish to read from it as follows:

You also request to be advised if the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury referred to on page 6 of my annual report, which prohibited the payment of tuition of Indian children in public schools where the State law entitled them to attend, would prevent the carrying into effect of the appropriation provided to aid the common schools of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma. The decision referred to was that of October 22, 1913, wherein the comptroller said:

"Contracts covering tuition of Indian pupils in a form like the contract considered in the decision of August 19, 1913, when made with reference to Indian children residing in States whose laws give them the full and free privilege of attending the public schools without reference to whether their parents pay taxes and whether or not the General Government pays something for their schooling, do not, as pointed out in said decision, involve any good and sufficient consideration for the payment by the United States of 'tuition fees' on their account. Under such contracts the school authorities neither give nor agree to give anything in return for the money paid or to be paid them by the Government. Such contracts, covering 'tuition 'of Indian children in California or any other State where such children are entitled by law to ail the school privileges that other children have, providing, as they do, for the furnishing of nothing that would not be furnished just the same if such contracts were not made, have no legal consideration to support them and are therefore unauthorized."

In order to obviate the difficulty presented by this decision a special provision was inserted in the paragraph providing for the support of Indian schools for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (Public—No. 160, 63d Cong., p. 3), as follows: "That not more than \$20,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for the purpose stated "in the discretion" of the Department of the Interior.

The C

they did not have legal consideration. Your attention, however, is called to the fact that the appropriation in aid of the common schools of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma is not paid to the various school districts under contract, but paid to the school districts directly by the cashier and special disbursing agent for the Five Civilized Tribes, in accordance with rules governing the distribution of this fund approved by the Secretary of the Interior October 3, 1914. No contracts are used in the disbursing of this fund.

It will appear by this statement of the commissioner that the language inserted in the appropriation bill for this fiscal year, providing that a portion of the appropriation may be expended for the tuition of Indian children enrolled in public schools has resulted in a decision by the Comptroller of the Treasury on September 19, 1914, changing his decision of August 19, 1913, and holding that it is within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to use the money for that purpose. I make this statement to correct what I said before, in order that no one will be related in the protect of the secretary of the be misled in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amend-

ment will be withdrawn.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the last clause, line 24, page 4, beginning with the word "including," would not be better English if it were made to read this way: "Including not to exceed \$40,000 for the support and education of deaf and dumb and blind Indian children "?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman will find it in

line 1 up here.

Mr. COOPER. As it is now it ought to be stricken out, for

it is not good English the way it reads now.

Mr. MANN. They had the word "for" in last year, and it

ought to be in now.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, I have no objection. Mr. COOPER, Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following

amendment. The language does not read well as it is now. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 1, strike out the words and figures "not to exceed \$40,000," and on page 4, line 24, after the word "including," insert the words and figures "not to exceed \$40,000 for."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including sewer, water, and lighting systems in connection therewith, and for the purchase of lands necessary for school and agency purposes, \$400.000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service, who are furnished quarters, necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: Provided further, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph. May I ask the chairman of the committee in reference to line 17, page 5, where it says, "and for the purchase of land necessary for school and agency purposes"?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman make the

point of order on the purchase of land necessary? Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I hope the gentleman will not do

that. It is subject to a point of order; I will admit that.

Mr. HARRISON. I was going to ask the gentleman, however, in the hearings what facts were presented to the committee about public schools and agency purposes that necessitated their

having more land.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state this: Very often these school reservations are made near a town, and it becomes necessary to open up roads from the towns and streets into the land occupied by these Indian reservations, schools, and so forth; and very often when they enlarge the schools they do not have sufficient room for the houses, hospitals, dormitories, and

so forth, necessary. Mr. HARRISON. What statement did the commissioner

make in reference to the need for this land?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is left in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to determine as to how much they will purchase, but they said in some instances they have to purchase additional land which is necessary, but it is never more than a few acres, and in most instances not more than half an acre.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman recall any instances that the commissioner stated the procurement of land for this

purpose was necessary

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think the hearings will show as to that, if the gentleman will look at them.

Mr. HARRISON. I was just asking the gentleman because

I was sure the gentleman had the information.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman insists on his point of order it will have to go out.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi in-

sist on his point of order?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against lines 17, 18, and 19, which read:

And for the purchase of lands necessary for school and agency pur-

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. , Mr. Chairman, I admit the point. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including sewer, water, and lighting systems in connection therewith, and for the purchase of lands necessary for school and agency purposes, \$400.000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service, who are furnished quarters, necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund charge-able with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: Provided further, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. At the bottom of the proviso in this paragraph is the

word. At the bottom of the proviso in this paragraph is the language:

Provided further, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amount for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. MANN. From the bill, because there is no such thing as the act referred to.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Now, what is the question the

gentleman raises?

Mr. MANN. I just called attention to the sloppy way of getting up the bill. It refers to the compensation provided for in section 1 of a certain act, but there is no such compensation covering those employees, but there is a reference about some other employees and some other act. That is all there is to it. It is not the fault of the committee; that is the way the estimates are sent down, I suppose.
Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. V

We followed the estimates and

the old bill.

Without ever looking to see whether they were Mr. MANN. correct or not. I had more curiosity than the gentleman or his committee have.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That last remark is gratuitous. Mr. MANN. Of course, they would not have kept it in there if they had.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools, and for placing school pupils, with the consent of their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, industrial, and educational training, \$72,000: Provided, That not exceeding \$5,000 of this sum may be used for obtaining remunerative employment for Indian youths and, when necessary, for payment of transportation and other expenses to their places of employment. The provisions of this section shall also apply to native pupils of school age under 21 years of age brought from Alaska.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph. I desire to get some information from the chairman of the committee. In line 8, page 6, it reads:

Provided, That not exceeding \$5,000 of this sum may be used for obtaining remunerative employment for Indian youths and, when necessary, for payment of transportation and other expenses to their places of employment.

Has it always been the policy of the committee to appropriate money to pay the transportation of these Indian youths to schools and from schools and to places of employment, and to

appropriate money to get them a job?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That has been done for a number of years around industrial schools, in the Phoenix School, Carlisle, and numerous others, where the superintendents of those schools for a number of years have looked out for the employment of these girls and boys in their schools. The girls are hired out, or hire themselves out. The superintendents see that they make good, and see that they are in the hands of proper employers, and that they attend to their ordinary duties as cooks, laborers, and so forth, right along the lines of the industrial school which they have just attended.

The young men are hired out among the farmers. Some of them have been trained as blacksmiths and tailors and shoemakers, and all that, and places are sought for those, and since months' employment at times is given to them. It is a great advantage to the pupils to mix them among the white people throughout the country, and it is a great advantage to the Indian Service.

Mr. HARRISON. Do I understand from this paragraph that the Government has persons employed to go around and collect

these Indian youths and encourage them to get remunerative jobs with white families?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is the duty of the superin-

tendents and the teachers.

Mr. HARRISON. How many persons are employed to do

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. You will find that in the hearings. There are several hundred pupils placed that way every year.

Mr. HARRISON. Can the gentleman give me any idea at all as to how many are employed?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have been told that about 100

are employed in the Carlisle School and not so many in the school at Phoenix. That is true at Chilocco and at other places.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think the gentleman understood

my question. Does the Indian Service have persons employed to go all through the United States and even up to Alaskabecause this provision extends to Alaska-and collect young Indians and carry them to the schools and then take them away from the schools and then get them remunerative employment in families?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand the teachers of the schools during the vacation look out for the pupils, for their vacation next year.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, the Government has no persons employed for that particular service?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Not especially.

Mr. HARRISON. If they have not any persons particularly employed for that special work, then the teachers do that work, and they are provided for in other appropriations in this bill, are they not?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As to that, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], who can best answer the

gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. They have a regular office in the Indian Bureau called the Indian Employment Bureau, with an educated Indian at the head of it, and it is his business to look after the interests of Indian employees in the Indian Service and after the employment of Indian people. I assume that part of the money carried in this item is for the purpose of get-ting employment for children when they have finished their courses at the industrial schools, and that these schools have persons employed for that purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. But, from the reading of it, it looks as though the Government collected and transported these children to the Indian schools and public schools, as well as transported

them from the Indian schools and public schools.

Mr. CARTER. It says, "For collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools." That is one proposition. And then there is another, "and for placing school pupils, with the consent of their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, indus-That is another proposition. trial, and educational training."

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.
Mr. CARTER. The transportation applies to the Indians when they go to and from school?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.
Mr. CARTER. Then there is the provision made for the man who looks after getting them employment when they complete their school courses.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, in this bureau that the gentleman speaks of, there are persons employed whose duty it is to go throughout the country and collect the Indian children who are sent to these industrial schools?

Mr. CARTER. Not in the bureau.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, who does that service?

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman ask who sends the children to school?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I think the superintendents on the reservations mostly look after that.

Mr. HARRISON. I notice the last clause in this paragraph

That the provisions of this section shall also apply to native pupils of school age under 21 years of age brought from Alaska.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Government, under this appropriation, bring these youths from Alaska down to the various places in the United States and get them employment?

Mr. CARTER. They do. Mr. MANN. They put them in the side shows. [Laughter.] Mr. HARRISON. How many cases does the gentleman recall

where that has been done?

Mr. CARTER. I have seen several Alaskan pupils in the schools.

Mr. HARRISON. That is pretty expensive, is it not?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I should judge it is quite expensive. Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman really thinks that this appropriation ought to stay in the bill, does he?

I voted to report it. Mr. CARTER.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr.

STEPHENS | moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] if any of this \$72,000 for transporting pupils to schools is used for transporting pupils from Nebraska, for example, to the Carlisle Indian School, in Pennsylvania?

Mr. CARTER. If any of them are there, it is.
Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. A great many of them are
there. I notice that this bill carries an appropriation of \$189 per capita for the Carlisle Indian School pupils and \$160 per capita for pupils at the Genoa Indian School in Nebraska, and many of our Nebraska Indian children are now in Carlisle. Does the gentleman believe that practice ought to be continued?

Mr. CARTER. I do not believe so, if your school in Nebraska

can accommodate them.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. The Nebraska school has capacity for 400 children, and the committee has provided for a capacity of 375 children and it has appropriated \$160 per capita.

Now, then, it would seem to me that this transportation of pupils from Nebraska to Pennsylvania ought to be stopped, and that the Nebraska Indian children that are to be educated should be compelled to go to the Nebraska institution. Does the

gentleman know of any way whereby that can be brought about?
Mr. CARTER. Well, if your schools cost less per capita I think certainly the Nebraska schools should be filled before the charge of transportation across the country is paid to another

school several hundred miles away.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. The Assistant Commissioner of the Indian Department requested that an appropriation for 400 pupils should be made for the Genoa school. They have an enrollment of 395, but the committee has recommended an appropriation for only 375 and it has appropriated only \$160 per capita, whereas the standard originally fixed by law, I believe, was \$170 per capita.

Mr. CARTER. We have provided all you asked for per

capita.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. That may be; but the superintendent asked for 400 pupils, and you appropriated for only 375, and are continuing to send Nebraska children to Pennsyl-

vania to school.

The point that I am making, and the point that should be taken into account in the distribution of the appropriation for these Indian children, should be their location and the economy of placing them in the various schools throughout the country. Certainly it would be much better to educate the Nebraska Indian children in the Nebraska school, and I believe that is the policy of the committee, and I am sure that in this particular case the committee made a mistake. I will call their attention to it later on. But the particular thing that I wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman from Oklahoma is whether or not these pupils were transported there, and if so, whether it was against good policy? I believe the gentleman agrees with me that it is not good policy to ship these children to Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTER. I believe it is the best policy to educate the Indian child at a point near home, even from many standpoints other than that of economics. I note from the report on the Genoa School that the average attendance at that school last

year was only 340.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. And the enrollment was 395.

Mr. CARTER. And the enrollment 397.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And that the capacity of the school is 400, and the commissioner recommended 400.

Mr. CARTER. I presume the committee cut this down because the average attendance last year was less than we had

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. My thought was that the committee had undoubtedly overlooked the fact that these children had been sent to Pennsylvania to be educated, and that when attention was called to it it might be corrected.

Mr. CARTER. No; we had not overlooked that. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

All moneys appropriated herein for school purposes among the Indians may be expended, without restriction as to per capita expenditure, for the annual support and education of any one pupil in any school.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that paragraph. I will reserve it if the gentleman wants to say anything.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Page of North Carolina). The gentleman from Mississippi reserves the point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That was a matter that the department was very anxious to get into the bill, but I concede that it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. I make the point of order.
The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.
Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we recur to the paragraph on page 4 with respect "to relieving distress among the Indians," for the purpose of offering an amendment that the Chair has just passed on by sustaining the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] that I think ought to be given more consideration. I feel sure that the decision was given too hastily, and it is so important a ruling that I think probably it ought to be given more consideration.

The CHAIRMAN, The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to recur to page 4, for the purpose of offer-

ing an amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I shall have to object, for the reason that I desire to get through with the bill, and then

recur to such points as any gentleman may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas at this time

objects.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman reserve that just a moment?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. The reason why I ask it is that this presents the same question that will be presented probably several times in the consideration of this bill. For that reason I should like to have the matter settled now.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The next time it comes up-Mr. HARRISON. I think the Chair was wrong in his ruling. Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The next time it comes up I am willing to have it considered, if the two are on all fours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, and to educate Indians in the proper care of forests; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, for necessary traveling expenses of such matrons; and for furnishing necessary equipments and supplies and renting quarters for them where necessary; for the conducting of experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, cotton, and fruits, and for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen, in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; for necessary traveling expenses of such farmers and stockmen and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies for them; and for superintending and directing farming and stock raising among Indians, \$400,000: Provided, That the foregoing shall not, as to timber, apply to the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin: Provided further, That not to exceed \$25,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be used to conduct experiments on Indian school or agency farms to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, cotton, grains, vegetables, and fruits: Provided also, That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, and stockmen herein provided for shall not be included within the limitation on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves

a point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the chairman of the committee if part of this appropriation is to be used in the work in conjunction with the appropriation further on to provide 20 automobiles to go around and assist in preserving the forests?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is a separate item, but of

course will be used for the same work.

Mr. MANN. It provides for 20 new ones.

Mr. HARRISON. Do they need 20 new automobiles to help preserve the forests?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This is for the entire Indian Service, for which they are spending all the millions of dollars appropriated in this bill, and we considered that transportation by automobile in many instances will be cheaper than by any other means.

Mr. HARRISON. I make a point of order on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. On the entire paragraph? Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. HARRISON. The point of order is that at the bottom of this paragraph there is new legislation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. In what respect?

Mr. HARRISON. In the proviso

Provided also, That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, and stockmen herein provided for shall not be included within the limitation on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912.

That is a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. To the language just read by the Clerk the gentleman makes a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you make it to the whole paragraph? Mr. HARRISON. I make it to the whole paragraph.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think the last provision is new If the gentleman will move to strike it out, I shall have no objection

Mr. HARRISON. No; I make the point of order against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the whole paragraph, with the exception of the last proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on pages 6 and 7, by inserting the matter in the bill from the beginning of line 19 on page 6 to the word "fruits" in line 16 on

Mr. MANN. I call the attention of my friend from Mississippi to the fact that the last proviso refers to a limitation on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912. There is no limitation on salaries contained in that act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I move to strike out the last

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending. The gentleman can address himself to that amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will address myself to

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recog-

nized for five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, when the last Indian bill was under consideration I assisted in an effort to strike out the pay of a special Indian commissioner on the ground that he had not within the memory of man visited the States of Oregon and Washington, where there are a large number of tribes of Indians. I am not going to object to this item for the pay of teachers and special instructors in regard to forest trees, cotton, grains, vegetables, and fruits, although I do hope some of them will visit Washington and Oregon and give our Indians some instruction. Of course we have no cotton, but I have 19 tribes of Indians in the district I have the honor to represent. They are badly in need of all kinds of instruction as to how to make a living except in the matter of fishing. A great many are sick. One of these special Indian conmissioners or inspectors visited the State as a result of a statement made on the floor, and his first recommendation was that they should have a doctor; that he was badly needed. Forty or more of these Indians were dying from tuberculosis. vertisement was put out for a doctor for the Queniult Indian Reservation, the pay not to exceed \$720 a year. The nearest place that a doctor could live would be 40 miles away, and he would have to pay his own expenses of travel. As a result no one has asked for that position as doctor. The Indians have had to struggle along without medical assistance. make this suggestion in hope that some of these Indian efficials will visit that part of the country.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, does the gen-

tleman from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] seriously insist upon his point of order that he has made as to that part of the para-

graph that has gone out?

Mr. HARRISON. I was not aware of the truth of the fact that has been stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] that the proviso in language was wrong. I took it from the committee's language that there was a limitation in the act of August 24, 1912, but if it does not change existing law I am willing to withdraw the point of order that was sustained.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman

that the act of 1897 fixes the amount that may be expended at an Indian agency for salaries and compensation of the employees. Now, unless we do make this appropriation available beyond that limit by putting in the proviso you might as well not make the appropriation. In a moment I will have the act of 1897, which limits the amount that may be expended at any If the gentleman is willing to let the appropriation be agency. If the gentleman is willing to let the appropriation be made, he ought to consent to the proviso against which he

has made the point of order. I do not think the gentleman desires to be captious.

Mr. HARRISON. Not a bit; it struck me it was a change of

salary.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It has nothing to do with a change of salary. It simply provides, in the Indian Service, where we are conducting industrial work, for farming, care of timber, matrons, and teaching the Indians to become self-supporting. It is absolutely necessary that we have a larger number of employees than we had when there was nothing to do at an agency except to keep track of the Indians and issue them rations at stated intervals. This has to do with the farmers, looking after the timber, the matrons, and the employees that do the real work of instructing the Indians.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman from South Dakota has just said, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order made to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to withdraw his point or order.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentle-man from Mississippi has made a point of order and the Chair has sustained it. I suggest that the proper way is to reoffer the paragraph

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to suggest to the gentleman from Texas that in offering his amendment he in-

clude the entire paragraph.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will do that, Mr. Chairman. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas modifies his amendment by including the paragraph beginning on line 19, page 6, and ending on line 21, page 7.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the language which it is now pro-

posed to insert reads:

Provided also, That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, and stockmen herein provided for shall not be included within the limitation on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1942.

The only thing in the act of August 24, 1912, on the subject is this:

Provided also, That the amounts paid to the matrons, farmers, and stockmen herein provided for shall not be included within the limitation on salary and compensation of employees contained in the act of June 7.

So that this is not a limitation at all. Now all this bill provides is that the sum carried in this bill shall not be included in the limitation of the act of August 24, 1912. There is no limita-

tion in the act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. In line 17 you will see that the word "forester" has been added, and that is the reason why

this has been put in.

Mr. MANN. That makes no difference; there is no limitation in the act of 1912. That act provides that that act shall not be covered by the limitation of the act of June 7, 1897. That makes no difference; there is no limitation

Mr. BURKE of South Daketa. The act of June 7, 1897, reads

as follows.

Hereafter not more than \$10,000 shall be paid in any one year for salaries or compensation for employees regularly employed at any one agency for its conduct and management, and the number and kind of employees at each agency shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and none other shall be employed.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Texas to change the date mentioned in his amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend my amendment so as to strike out the words "act of August 24, 1912," and insert "June 7, 1897."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to

the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 7, by striking out in lines 20 and 21 the words "August 24, 1912," and insert "June 7, 1897."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to. The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, on line 10, page 7, is the provision: "Provided, That the foregoing shall not, as to timber, apply to the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin." Why is that provision necessary?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Because there is a separate act controlling the timber of these Indians.

Mr. HARRISON. It applies solely to that reservation.
Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.
Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to line 3, on page 6, for the purpose of inserting the words "June 7, 1897," in lieu of the words "August 24, 1912."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to return to line 3, page 6, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 6, line 3, by striking out "August 24, 1912," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 7, 1897."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask why that is offered? Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is exactly the same proposition, and it is to correct the language in the bill to conform to the correction we have just made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of goods and supplies for the Indian Service, including inspection, pay of necessary employees, and all other expenses connected therewith, including advertising, storage, and transportation of Indian goods and supplies, \$300,000: Provided, That no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be used for the maintenance of to exceed three warehouses in the Indian Service.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the previous appropriation bill it is provided that there should not be more than three permanent warehouses, and in this bill the word "permanent" has been stricken out. Is it the intention to move these warehouses from one place

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the Indian appropriation bill of last year carried a provision that not more than three permanent warehouses should be maintained by this fund. Since that time we find that none of the warehouses has been dis-pensed with. There were five at that time, and there were five at the time the Indian Bureau officials were before our com-They stated to us that two of the warehouses had been arried along as temporary warehouses, and it would perhaps not be necessary to carry them any longer as temporary warehouses; so in the future there should be only three warehouses provided for by this bill, and under this provision not more than three could be maintained, even as temporary.

Mr. FOSTER. But really it is to get rid of two of them?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the office is very desirous of having this language as it was carried in last year's bill, in order to have the privilege of providing for temporary warehouses for a part of the year. We have been trying to get rid of these five warehouses ever since I have been in Congress, and we thought we had done it finally when we put in the provision we did last year, but the hearings disclosed that we still had five warehousesthree permanent and two temporary—and so we struck out the word "temporary"; but the office says there are certain seasons of the year when they ought to have the privilege of maintaining temporary warehouses.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, we thought we had stricken

them out once before.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. We have been striking them out for the last 15 years, and I think this puts all of them out

but three. I am quite willing.

Mr. MANN. If my friend from South Dakota will permit an interruption, I suggest that it is safe to say that they will not go out while my distinguished friend the Senator from Nebraska is in the United States Senate.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Illinois

is looking after his city apparently.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I never had to bother about that. That keeps itself on its merits. I have always been in favor of cutting them all out and letting them rest on their merits.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of the Board of Indian Commissioners, \$4,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does the gentleman know how much has been expended by the Board of Indian Commissioners?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do not think there has been any report made, at least none was furnished to our committee.

Mr. MANN. We used to appropriate about \$4,000.
Mr. FOSTER. Ten thousand dollars.
Mr. MANN. No; \$4,000. Last year we increased it to \$10,000. Had the committee any information before it on which reduced that amount?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This is the estimate that has been furnished by the department, and I presume there has

been some report made to them by this Board of Indian Commissioners

Mr. MANN. Did they make an estimate for only \$4,000? Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That was all of the estimate

handed in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by placing therein an explanation of the services and the work of the Board of Indian Commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of Indian police, including chiefs of police at not to exceed \$50 per month each and privates at not to exceed \$30 per month each, to be employed in maintaining order, for purchase of equipments and supplies and for rations for policemen at nonration agencies, \$150,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move, on line 21, page 8, to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$125,000"—no, "\$100,000." Mr. CARTER. Why not leave it at \$125,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 8, line 21, by striking out "\$150,000" and inserting \$100,000."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that, in view of the fact that \$50,000 was put in in the other bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of judges of Indian courts where tribal relations now exist, \$8,000

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] increased the prohibition item to \$125,000. He now takes \$50,000 off again. I want to ask the gentleman if in the last analysis he has accomplished anything on the prohibition proviso? He takes it from Peter and pays Paul. The items now aggregate just as much as they did before they were stricken out; and I will ask the gentleman if he does not think he is playing hot with one amendment and

cold with the other?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I had thought that my friend from Oklahoma would get into this prohibition discussion before it was over and express himself to his constituents as being for it. He did not get the opportunity when the other provision was up, and so he gets in now. I did not agree with the chairman of the committee [Mr. Stephens], in his argument some moments ago against my motion to increase the appropriation in the bill for the suppression of the liquor traffic among the Indians, that these policemen had very much to do with it, because in reading the hearings before the committee and the debates in prior Congresses in support of these police officers I find that the Members of the delegation from Oklahoma, in practically every instance, say that these Indian policemen are merely old, trusty fellows who are just out there to give information occasionally about depredations on Indian reservations and to carry messages from officers of the Government to various places, nowhere saying they arrest for traffic in liquors among the Indians; and so, in view of these arguments that have been made by Members from Oklahoma against prior appropriations for police service, have made this motion to reduce this appropriation from \$150,000 to \$100,000.

Will the gentleman yield? Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. Mr. FERRIS. I know the gentleman does not mean to misquote me. I think the gentleman perhaps quotes some of the things I have said about this matter, but my attitude has been in advocacy of the policemen every year I have been in Congress. I think they have, indeed, served a good purpose-two purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Now, Mr. Chairman, in speaking on this question, here is what the gentleman from Oklahoma, in speaking of their duties, said about these policemen in April, 1912:

They help keep the peace among the Indians. Another thing which I omitted to state, there are usually old, trusted, tried Indians around every reservation who are known to the white people and to the agents, and the agent usually designates some such Indian, who serves as a gobetween in all these matters between the Indians, the agency, and also between the white people and the Indians having business relations.

He says, though:

I do not think the appropriation ought to be stricken out.

That argument of the gentleman was on a motion made to strike out the whole provision, and was made, I think, by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT]. I may be mistaken about it being Mr. DAVENPORT; but, at any rate, Mr. DAVENPORT, in arguing the question, went on to say that these police officers were doing more harm than they were doing good, and he said-I read from his remarks:

I think the gentleman from Kansas-

He must have been talking about my friend Mr. CAMPBELL over there—no; I notice from a further reading of the RECORD he was talking about Mr. Jackson, who was then a Member of Congress. He said:

I think the gentleman from Kansas is correct in regard to the organization of the Indian police in a number of these places. So far in the Cherokee Nation and a portion of the Creek Nation it has been nothing more or less than a political organization in the last four years.

Now, that is the testimony of Mr. DAVENPORT, my friend's colleague here, who says that in that part of Oklahoma "it was a political organization," and I think my friend Mr. Ferris at that time thought that it was a kind of political organization. The gentleman shakes his head, evidently meaning "no," but I recall at that time the Republicans were in power, and it is my recollection, I may be in error about it, that there was a general comment upon this side of the House against that side of the House that these policemen out there were a set of political officeholders, performing no respectable service and merely organizing and working in the interest of the Republican Party.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. My good friend from Mississippi of course knows one thing, and that is that Mr. Davenport and myself did not agree about that matter. I believe the words the gentleman read from me were words in support of the Indian police, man read from me were words in support of the Indian police, and I think that my record will show without any interruption at all that I have asked for them each year. I do not think I am entitled to such howling credit for doing it, but I have never

opposed them, as my record will show.

Mr. HARRISON. I think the record, so far as my good friend here is concerned, shows that he was in favor of cutting down the appropriation for these policemen at that time. but not striking it out entirely, as our friend Mr. DAVENPORT

was in favor of doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes,

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

[After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS. I think what the gentleman has in mind was

the general objection I made to too many employees in Oklahoma and elsewhere in the Indian Service, and I am not relenting on that objection now. I said then there were too many of them, and I think now there are too many, and if that statement relieves anybody in any way they are welcome to it,

and I am still of the same opinion.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to hear my friend say that, because I have at least convinced him that there is not much kindredship between this amendment I have offered cutting down useless policemen and the one I offered a while ago to aid in suppressing the liquor traffic among the Indians. Mr. DAVENPORT, in speaking of these policemen, further said:

Great complaint has gone up among the people there because of that one fact. It now has a tendency to bring about discord and dissatisfaction, and it brings about conflict between the local officers and these police that goes on and will continue to go on, and if the bill was in such shape that I could make the motion to amend, I would provide an amendment by which there should be no Indian police appointed by the department in any organized town or municipality within any organized State.

Now, that is pretty good testimony. But here is what my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] said in discussing at that time this police question. Surely something must have come over the spirit of his dreams since he made this speech. Here is what he then said:

Now, I am very sure that we have too many Indian police in Oklahoma, and there is a good deal of truth in the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Jackson] and in the statement of my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. Davenport]. I would favor dispensing with these agents entirely in Oklahoma at the first time if it were not for the reason I have stated, were it not that it might slightly disorganize the Indian Service and leave them without men to do this specific work.

Mr. Chairman, there are, I believe, as shown by the hearings, six hundred and some odd of these Indian police, and there is six hundred and some odd of these Indian police, and there is nothing in the hearings that states that these policemen ever arrested anybody for selling liquor to an Indian. But as my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris] has said, they were "old, trusty Indians, who carried messages back and forth," and as my friend Davenport said, "a political organization out there creating discord and strife among those people." My friend Davenport went further, and said that the State of Oklahoma

could attend to its own local affairs and did not want these policemen there intermeddling in them.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON, Yes

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman when this colloquy took place that he speaks of?

Mr. HARRISON. This was in April, 1912. Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Has there been a change in

the administration since that time?

Mr. HARRISON. I think there has been. [Laughter on the Republican side.] So I submit that in view of these facts that I have presented and in order to help Oklahoma to attend to their own local affairs, and in order to help the general situa-tion throughout the country, the force of these Indian police should be reduced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missis-

sippi has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order. There is nothing before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman from Mississippi with-

draw his amendment?

Mr. HARRISON. I did not. I now withdraw it. The CHAIRMAN. The amendment was adopted.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There is nothing pending, Mr. Chairman, and I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of special agents at \$2,000 per annum; for traveling and incidental expenses of such special agents, including sleeping-car fare, and a per diem of not to exceed \$3 in lieu of subsistence, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, when actually employed on duty, in the field or ordered to the seat of government; for transportation and incidental expenses of officers and clerks of the Office of Indian Affairs when traveling on official duty; for pay of employees not otherwise provided for; and for other necessary expenses of the Indian Service for which no other appropriation is available, \$100,000.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to reserve a point of

order on the paragraph.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] a few minutes ago claimed to be a great prohibitionist. He wanted to increase the appropriation in order that efficiency might be gained in the suppression of the liquor traffic among the Indians. A few moments later he strikes out the same amount from another appropriation that is used for the same purpose.

The gentleman says it is not so used. If the gentleman had only read the hearings, he would not have made that statement. I will read what the Assistant Commissioner of Indian

Affairs says on page 72 of the hearings. He says:

Affairs says on page 12 of the hearings. He says:

The Chairman, Is it a part of the duties of these policemen to prevent the sale of liquors on the various reservations?

Mr. Meritt. They help in that work.

The Chairman. Then you have another appropriation for that purpose, have you not?

Mr. Meritt. But this only supplements their regular work.

The Chairman. Why shouldn't these two items be thrown together?

Is it any more important that they be protected from the sale of whisky than anything else?

Mr. Meritt. It is one of the most important things in the Indian Service, that they be protected from Ilquor.

Mr. Harrison. Mr. Chairman. I withdraw my point of

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi with-draws his point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of 6 Indian Service inspectors, at salaries not to exceed \$2,500 per annum and actual traveling expenses, and \$3 per diem in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty in the field, \$30,000,

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. How much was expended for this purpose last year?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will find the item in a moment. The gentleman will find it on page 75. This item was inserted in the appropriation bill last year, and there has been no report made on these special inspectors.

Mr. MANN. The inspectors have not been employed yet,

have they?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I can not say as to that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Not all of them, as I understand. Mr. MANN. Have any of them been employed?

Mr. MANN. What are they to do: what is the necessity of them?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They are special inspectors who have the entire inspection of all the various Indian agencies in

every State of the Union under their charge.

Mr. MANN. Was this in the bill as it was passed by the House last year, or was this a Senate item?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think it was put in in the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Was it not to create political jobs for political purposes? Does the gentleman know whether these appointments are made by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior on their own motion, or whether they are made from an eligible list?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They are made, as I understand, from an eligible list, and it seems they have not been able yet to determine among the eligible applicants who should be

Mr. MANN. Have they got an eligible list? Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. So I understand.

Mr. MANN. Is that the understanding of my friend from

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will read what we have here.

This is the same provision as that of the current law and is essential to a clean administration of the Indian Service. These inspectors will be selected through the Civil Service Commission after an exhaustive investigation of their character, business ability, and capacity for the detail of looking into the manifold activities of this bureau. These officers are considered the most important connected with the field administration of the millions of dollars worth of property belonging to these dependent peoples, as well as their development into healthy, moral, capable, and law-abiding citizens of our country. The amount requested has been carefully decided as adequately sufficient for an economical administration, and will permit of the employment of a most valuable corps of inspectors. Any less amount will have a serious tendency to depreciate its value in morale and efficiency. The need for this appropriation was thoroughly and exhaustively presented to the Congress at the last session, the reiteration of which appears unnecessary in justification of the continuance of the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. Who was testifying there—the commissioner?
Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This is the report made by the commissioner, printed in the hearings.
Mr. MANN. That these officers were necessary for "a clean administration" of the Indian Department. Is that what he

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is the language, I believe.

Mr. MANN. And yet, although this appropriation has been in force for over a year, the department prefers not to have a clean administration" and has not appointed these inspectors?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It takes some time to get the proper men, and it has been only a comparatively short time Mr. MANN. Well, it ought not to take more than six months.

The Indian appropriation bill became a law last year-when?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Yes; for information,

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. In the last session, when the Indian appropriation bill was being considered in another body after it had passed the House, it was proposed to insert an amendment providing for the appointment of six Indian inspectors, and making their appointment possible by the Secretary of the Interior without regard to the civil-service requirements, In other words, making them political appointments. It met with considerable opposition on account of the way it was proposed to make the appointments, and the amendment was with-drawn and then put in the bill in the form in which it finally became a law, the President in the meantive having by Executive order excepted the places from the classified service and providing that the appointments should be made by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in conjunction with the Civil Service Commission. I believe the commissioner has to consult the Civil Service Commission as to the qualification of applicants, but the appointments are not made from an eligible list as appointments are ordinarily made in the classified service. If any

examination is required I am sure it is not competitive.

Mr. MANN. These are just pure political appointments, made
by the commissioner, are they not? That is, they will be when
they are made. I suppose they will be used in connection with
the machine to renominate the President. That seems to be the

way in which appointments are being made now. Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I presume one of the principal requisites will be that they shall belong to the party of the administration.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall be quite disappointed if they are not. Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does not the gentleman think that would be an advantage to the service?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is not that the reason why they are having so much difficulty in finding suitable men? Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think not.

Mr. MANN. They want to see where the pressure is the greatest before appointing them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of determining the heirs of deceased Indian allottees having any right, title, or interest in any trust or restricted property, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, \$100,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use not to exceed \$25,000 for the employment of additional clerks in the Indian Office in connection with the work of determining the heirs of deceased Indians, and considering their wills, out of the \$100,000 appropriated herein: Provided further, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the Osage Indians, nor to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma: And provided further, That hereafter upon a determination of the heirs to any trust or restricted Indian property or after approval by the Secretary of any will covering such trust or restricted property, there shall be paid by such heirs, or by the beneficiaries under such will, or from the estate of the decedent, or from the proceeds of sale of the allotment, or from any trust funds belonging to the estate of the decedent, the sum of \$15, which amount shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury of the United States and a report shall be made annually to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, on or before the first Monday in December, of all moneys collected and deposited, as herein provided: Provided further, That if the Secretary of the Interior shall find that any inherited trust allotment or allotments are capable of partitioned among them, patents in fee to be issued to the incompetent heirs for their shares and trust patents to be issued to the incompetent heirs for the lands respectively or jointly set apart to them, the trust period to terminate in accordance with the terms of the original patent.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether

or not this paragraph is new legislation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The last paragraph was not in the bill of last year. With that exception it is the same bill that we passed last year—the same amounts and so forth.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. For 1914 you passed the same amounts?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The same amounts, and in the same language, with the exception that we have the new provision at the end.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that the language is quite different, but the appropriation is the same.

Mr. FOSTER. It is changed somewhat here.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I notice that \$25,000 of it is to be used for the purpose of paying clerk hire.

Mr. MANN. Last year that was \$20,000.
Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We have inserted the word wills." That provision is the only material change

wills." That provision is the only material change.
Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. To whom is the \$75,000 to be paid?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is a reimbursable amount. Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. To whom is it to be paid, and in what way is it to be paid out?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is for the purpose of determining the heirs of deceased Indian allottees having any right. title, or interest in any trust or restricted property, and it may be determined either by men whom they send out armed with that authority or through the courts. That is, under rules and regulations prescribed by the department as to who shall make these determinations

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Are these employees now in the regular employment of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They are.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. It is not intended to go outside of

the department to employ people to make these examinations to determine these titles?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There is no authorization of that kind in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Is there anything to prevent that? Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do not think they could employ special employees under the language here. That is the only authority they have.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Does the department do anything except prescribe the rules by which these titles may be perfected?

Mr. MANN. Oh, they determine the heirship. Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. In accordance with the act of June 25, 1910.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I want to suggest an amendment.

Mr. MANN. The department determines the heirship now, under this provision.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Who gathers the information?

Mr. MANN. They have special employees to do it.
Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Do they appoint outside attorneys to look up information and bring it to the department?

Mr. MANN. They could, but usually they have regular men doing that work.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. In order that they may be regu-

lar men, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. But it might not always be desirable to have a regular man. For instance, supposing you wanted to settle the heirship of an Indian at some place around Washington or at places in various parts of the country.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to reserve a point

of order. I suppose the gentleman from Minnesota withdraws

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Yes: I withdraw the point of

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order of the gentle-

man from Mississippi?

Mr. HARRISON. I want to make the point of order for the purpose of seeking some information about an item in line 19, page 9, where there is an increase from \$20,000 to \$25,000 for the employment of additional clerks in the Indian Office.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs and can not give much information in regard to the matter, but I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that a few years ago there was a great contest in reference to the proof of heirship of Indians and the settlement of Indian estates. There was inserted in the Indian bill only two or three years ago a provision that the Secretary of the Interior should determine the heirship and to that extent settle the estate of the Indian, who should pay for it. It has been the best work Congress has done in that respect for many years. They made available last year for this purpose \$20,000 for clerks here. Of course no one could tell exactly how much would be required. Now they want \$25,000. We would have to take their judgment as to the amount that is required, because this is really a new item and has not been in the bill many years.

Mr. HARRISON. I had an impression that there was some amount carried in a general appropriation bill, or in a deficiency appropriation bill, to provide for clerks of this office in Wash-

ington.

Mr. MANN. The appropriation contained a proviso that no part of it could be used for clerks in Washington, and the gen-tleman recalls that the general law is that where a lump-sum appropriation is made no portion of it can be used for clerical assistance in the city of Washington unless specifically authorized. That is what the deficiency bill which the gentleman refers to did; it specifically authorized the use of a portion of that money in the city of Washington.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, in view of what has been

said, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 9, line 16: After the word "property" strike out the words "under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of " and insert in lieu thereof the words "the rules of the department of."

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the hope that if it is adopted it will prevent what appears to me to be possible under the original text, and that is the employment of attorneys not in the regular employment of the department. I must confess that I am making this statement at this time for the information of the committee and with the hope of getting some information myself. I have great respect and confidence in our Committee on Indian Affairs, and of course each Member of Congress receives some information from his constituents. Much of the time the information is not founded on reliable facts. I am going to read a statement, for the benefit of the committee, contained in a letter which I received from one of my constituents, a very able man, who has written a history of our State and who is at the present time writing a history of the Government's relation to and treatment of the Indians of this country. He says, in part:

I am informed that there is a scheme on foot to rob the Chippewa Indians of some half million dollars, to be divided between certain attorneys, certain influential half breeds, and certain gentlemen resident in and about the Capital City. The scheme implies the legitimatization of the employment of the attorneys by the Indians.

I wish to say for the benefit of the committee that I have examined House bill 12579 of last session, the bill supposed to contain such a scheme, and I find no such legislation or anything that could be construed into such an intention or purpose; but, for fear that there may be some legislation that might give foundation for such an impression, I call attention to the statement in the letter, because it comes from such good authority, for what it is worth. I withhold the name of the writer.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is this writer in the Government

employ in any way

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. No; he is a private citizen in the State of Minnesota. As I said, he is at work on a history of the relations of the Government to and its treatment of the Indian.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The only change that the gentle-man makes in his amendment is to strike out the words "under the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior." Now, why should not the Secretary of the Interior prescribe rules by which his inferiors, the men whom he sends out to work, shall be guided? I can not imagine how it should be done in any other way except by the rules and regulations.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. That would be implied. If the department has the right to use the money, it would naturally follow that it would be done under such rules and regulations

as it might adopt.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If he can do it, why not write it

into the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. That is what I say. If the department is going to do it, why not make it positive that they have absolute control over it and that they will do it by regularly employed agents and not by outside attorneys? That is the point I am trying to impress. I am just leaving this to the committee. I have no personal pride in the amendment. If the committee feels, after the statement that I have made, that the amendment is not of particular value, then we should vote it

Mr. MANN. What does the gentleman think he would accomplish by his amendment? To say that this shall be done by the department instead of under regulations by the Secretary of the Interior would not make any difference.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Just this: Under the original text it is quite possible that the department can go outside the department and employ whomever it sees fit to do this work.

Mr. MANN. They could do it just as well in one case as in

the other.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. No; and they could prescribe rules and regulations under which it should be done. But if the department is to do it itself, then it has to do it by its regular agents and not by some temporary employee.

Mr. MANN. That would not follow at all.

That would not follow at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that his time be extended for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Here is an appropriation to be expended. It is precisely just as long one way as it is the other. To say that it shall be expended by the department or expended by the Secretary of the Interior means the same thing. That is what the appropriation is for-to be expended by the department. That is what we make the appropriation for. If you put it in every other line that it is to be expended by the department, it would not make it any stronger. The appropriation is for the Indian Service, in the Department of the Interior. Ordinarily where we put jurisdiction upon a department instead of saying the department we say the Secretary of that department, so as to centralize the responsibility, but it means the same thing whether you say it is to be done by the Secretary or by the department, because the Secretary does not do it personally. He does it by having somebody employed. You can employ some one outside just as well in one case as in the other. There is absolutely no distinction.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. If he were to do it under rules and regulations, and not by the department itself. The reason that I suggested for eliminating the term "rules and regula-tions" is that it implies that the department does not have to do it itself, but that it can let anyone do it. It can farm it out if it pleases, so long as it is done under rules and regulations. I want the department to do it itself and be responsible for it.

Mr. MANN. The department spends the money. This is an oppopriation. This is not an authorization. This is an apappropriation. propriation.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. For a particular purpose.

Mr. MANN. It does not make any difference. We are appropriating the money. Outside people can not spend the money. The department spends the money. Whether you say a certain thing is to be done under rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior or to be done by him does not make any difference. He makes his rules and regulations in

either event. That does not amount to anything, but the money is expended by the department. That is why we appropriate it.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. We want the department to do

the work. We do not want it to be farmed out.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman's language would not pre-

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians and to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops, \$200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, which sum may be used for the purchase of seed, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable indians to become self-supporting: Provided, That said sum shall be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1925: Provided further, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended on any one reservation or for the benefit of any one tribe of Indians.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that. May I ask the gentleman from Texas why on line 23, page 10, this amount of \$200,000 is made immediately available?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We provide this because we have Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We provide this because we have adopted the plan of having this industrial matter in the bill, so that after the 1st of July, when the money becomes available, they can go on the market and buy Indian supplies more cheaply that fall than they can by waiting until the money would be available. Sometimes they need money in advance for the purpose of pitching the crops and planting them, and buying agricultural implements, stock, and so forth.

Mr. MANN. It is because the fiscal year and the farm year

do not coincide.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is it.

Mr. HARRISON. This \$200,000 is to be expended in conjunction with this appropriation that will follow to buy 20 new automobiles to farm with, is it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; that is a separate item

entirely.

Mr. HARRISON. No; the two amounts that are appropriated are to be used to aid the Indians, to encourage them in industry and self-support?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is not, because every item here in the matter now before the House is reimbursable and comes

out of the Indian funds.

Mr. HARRISON. Does this item?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And comes out of the Indian fund; and it is for their maintenance and better support, and so that they can become better self-supporting.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask, for information, does the present law make it reimbursable? This paragraph does not say

anything about it being reimbursable.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. All of these items are reimburs-

Mr. HARRISON. In some of the paragraphs it says they are reimbursable, and some do not. Why is this distinction made?
Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Because when the appropriation

was made for the Indians, if afterwards they have funds out of which that appropriation can be reimbursed to the United States

Government, that amount is refunded.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the gentleman, but I do not think the gentleman quite got the point I am trying to get at. I notice, for instance, in the items carried on pages 2 and 3, for the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, and so forth, if you read in that paragraph, you will see that the \$250,000 is appropriated, but it says. "it is reimbursable as provided in the act of August 1, 1914"; and many other paragraphs so specify that the amounts appropriated "shall be reimbursable out of the tribal funds." Now, in this paragraph that is under consideration nothing at all is said about the amount being reimbursable. The question I asked the gentleman to answer is whether this item is reimbursable. You say in some paragraphs that the amount shall be reimbursable and in others that it shall not be reimbursable. Why is this distinction made?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This amounts to an allowance made by the Government to the Indians for the purpose of making them self-supporting in the manner set forth in all of these items, encouraging them in the way of being self-supporting, for the purchase of seed, animals, tools, and so forth, all of these intended to make them self-supporting.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand, but I do not think the gen-

tleman understands me.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And provides for a repaymentthe original bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Has the gentleman got the law there? That is what I am trying to get at. The reason why I ask is I want to offer an amendment to the paragraph if it is not reimbursable, but if it is reimbursable, of course I do not care to offer it.

Mr. CARTER. It is reimbursable.

Mr. HARRISON. Under what law? Mr. CARTER. It is reimbursable in the paragraph. If the gentleman will read the top of page 11, line 2, he will see:

Provided, That said sum shall be expended under conditions to be provided by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1925.

Mr. HARRISON. That answers my question.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, on that point I would like to inquire of some member of the committee in reference to this. I desire to call to the attention of the committee that this fixes 1925 as the time for repayment, and I desire to ask if that might not in some way involve the expiration of the trust period. I have in mind, for instance, a tribe of Indians, we will say, whose trust period expires in 1920.

Mr. MANN. That would not make any difference.

Mr. CARTER. This does not place any restrictions upon the land.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma last year the Indian Service asked that these appropriations be repaid by 1925, and then with authority to reinvest the sums as they were paid in prior to 1925, and at the end of that time reinvest it; but the House disagreed with that proposition, and that went out of the bill. Then it was fixed to make it a 10year period from the year 1915, which was the fiscal year we were then appropriating for.

Mr. FERRIS. I think I can still call to the mind of the gentleman cases where this would complicate things to fix any date definitely. If a tribe of Indians' trust period had expired and the land became taxable and salable and the restrictions were removed, our chances of getting our money back at

a later period would be nil.

Mr. MANN. I think the chances of getting the money back are pretty near nil now.

Mr. FERRIS. That may be.
Mr. MANN. The department has been urging this for years, and has been insisting that it was a self-supporting proposition, but they never have collected much money yet.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman think they ever will?

Mr. MANN. I do not say that they will not. Originally I was very much opposed to it, but I think they are doing very good work now. From some sources they collect money, and they are doing very well.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, irrespective of whether they

will or will not collect anything in the course of time, I do not think the date should be fixed at a date beyond the expiration of the Indian trust period, because if we get the money at all it will be by reason of fixing some sort of a lien against the

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris], like all the other gentlemen from the country districts, is interested in rural credits. Now, when the Government undertakes to advance money to a man to buy his team and buy cattle and locate him upon a farm and make him self-supporting. it can not expect that he will repay that money in less than 10 years. Ten years is a very short time if they make him pay it back.

Mr. FERRIS. Suppose there is a tribe of Indians whose trust period expires in 1920. Does the gentleman propose to postpone the payment five years beyond that?

Mr. MANN. I think this is a lien upon the land under the regulations of the department.

Mr. FERRIS. Has the gentleman in mind some regulations that worked out, that accomplished that?

Mr. MANN. That is my recollection, that they do make this lien upon the land, although I would not say positively that that is the case.

Mr. FERRIS. That is probably the only way they will ever

Mr. MANN. That is the only way they would ever get it from any of us.

Mr. FERRIS. That is probably true, too.
Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.
Mr. LENROOT. I do not think the department has yet devised any means of making it a lien upon the land. I do not believe that any of this money is expended except where there

are tribal funds either in existence or to come into existence by which they should be reimbursed.

Mr. FERRIS. I understood that this was to apply to Indians who had no tribal funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris] has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection. Mr. FERRIS. I thought this provision was really for Indians who had no tribal funds at all. Am I right about that? If they have money, there is no use in making the land a lien.

Mr. LENROOT. They may not have them now.

Mr. FERRIS. I understand. I have no objection, but I

think there should be a proviso added to this providing that the period fixed shall in no case extend beyond the life of the

trust period; but I shall not offer it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Stephens] at what time he proposes to rise? This next paragraph will require a good deal of discussion.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I had hoped to reach the page containing Arizona, beginning the list of States. That is at the

head of page 12. I think we can reach it in a short time.

Mr. HARRISON. This paragraph proposing to purchase an automobile would perhaps take a good deal of time. Would the gentleman move to rise

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman makes a point

of order, I shall have to.

Mr. HARRISON. Then I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Hab-MISON] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 20150) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows

To Mr. CLARK of Florida, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. Bell of Georgia, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business of the House that would be in order on Monday next be deferred, and that the appropriation bill now under consideration, namely, the Indian appropriation bill, shall then be in order.

Mr. MANN. I object

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I move, Mr. Speaker, that the regular business on Monday be deferred, and that the appropriation bill now under consideration—the Indian appropriation bill-be in order.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order, Mr. Speaker, and I make the point of order that the motion is not in order.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 4, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of Commerce submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$25,000 for promotion of export trade (H. Doc. No. 1470), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19475) granting a pension to Jacob Kuntz, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 20496) to grant lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 20497) to increase the authorized strength of the Coast Artillery Corps of the Army; to

the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 20498) to validate title to certain town sites in the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 20499) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Metropolis, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 20500) to prohibit interstate commerce in products branded or marked with the name of any church, religious denomination, society, or association, or the name or designation by which any such church or religious denomination is commonly known; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 396) authorizing and empowering the President to invite all nations to send delegates to a convention to provide for disarmament, and for the creation of an international legislature, an international court, an international army and navy police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Resolution (H. Res. 689) directing the Committee on Ways and Means to report a bill creating a tariff

mittee on Ways and Means to report a bill creating a tarin board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 690) to print 10,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 380, Sixty-third Congress, second session, entitled "Agricultural Credit, Land-Mortgage or Long-Term Credit," for the use of the House folding room; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 691) to print 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 214, Sixty-third Congress, first session, entitled "Agricultural Cooperation and Rural Credit in Europe, for the use of the House folding room; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:
By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 20501) granting a pension

to Daily Houston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20502) granting an increase of pension to Harvey J. Willis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 20503) granting a pension to Edna

Applegate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20504) granting an increase of pension to

Michael Demuth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20505) granting an increase of pension to

Robert L. Stroud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 20506) granting an increase

of pension to Jennie Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 20507) granting a pension to William A. Widrig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20508) granting an increase of pension to Martin Bury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 20509) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20510) granting an increase of pension to

Andrew Partridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 20511) granting an increase of pension to Emma Wilmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20512) granting a pension to Minnie S. Rector; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 20513) granting a pension to Thomas A. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 20514) granting a pension to Nellie V. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20515) granting an increase of pension to Theodore A. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20516) for the relief of C. G. Wilford; to

the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20517) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 20518) granting an increase of pension to L. M. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20519) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Jacob Joyner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20520) for the relief of the owners of the steamboat W. B. Savory; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 20521) granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Atherton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 20522) granting a pension to Bert Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 20523) granting a pension to Cleveland Shive; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 20524) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Premer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid

on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK; Resolutions adopted by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Taylor Lodge, No. 175. Newark, Ohio, favoring the passage of H. R. 17894 and S. 6165, to extend the boiler-inspection law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to export of arms and ammunition; to the Committee

on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of National Liberal Immigration League, relative to suspension of head tax on immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Diocesan Branch of the American Federation of Catholic Societies and St. Vincent de Paul's Lyceum, all of New York, protesting against the use of the mails by the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring House joint resolution 377, relative to export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of T. C. Beckwith, Providence, R. I., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Netti E. Bauer, of Providence, R. I., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Protests of the Hartford Business Men's Association, Hartford, Conn.; the New Departure Manufacturing Co., Bristol, Conn.; the Hartford Special Machinery Co., Hartford, Conn.; and Mr. Forrest Morgan, Hartford, Conn., relative to export trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protest of F. C. Monier, jr., of New Britain, Conn., relative to the exportation of firearms and ammunition; to the

Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: Papers to accompany bill granting relief to the owners of the steamboat W. B. Savory; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for relief of the estate of Jacob Joyner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for increase of pension to L. M.

Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHAN: Memorial of Hartford (Conn.) Business Men's Association, protesting against the passage of any legislation that will interfere with the exportation of the products of the United States to any country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of C. F. Kesting, J. C. Schmeds, B. H. Saager, and H. Juse, of Los Molinos, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Also, petition of Pilot Hill (Cal.) Local Socialist I

Local Socialist Lodge, favoring prohibition of exportation of foodstuffs; to the Com-

mittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Luis Obispo (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring Hamili civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Fred Miller, Redding, Cal., favoring repeal of that section of Constitution of the United States which reads: "The Congress shall have power to borrow money on the credit of the United States"; to the Committee on the

Judiciary.

By Mr. REED: Petition of 252 merchants of the first New Hampshire congressional district, favoring the passage of H. R.

5308; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Memorial of Hebrews of Meriden, Conn., relative to literacy test in the Smith immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Hartford (Conn.) Business Men's Association, protesting against law prohibiting exportation of the products of the United States to any other country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

Monday, January 4, 1915.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the

following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy guidance and blessing as we start upon the uncharted paths of a new year. We recognize Thy goodness to us in all the providences that have surrounded us in the year that has gone, and we seek Thy favor that we may follow the light that shines upon the path of the just more and more unto the perfect day. We praise Thee for peace within all our boundaries, and for the high spirit of brotherhood that animates those who are the leaders of the people. We pray that Thy grace may be upon Thy servants in this Senate, that they may have the spirit of Christian statesmen, and that they may be witnesses for God for peace unto the uttermost parts of the earth. Hear us in our prayer; accept the praises of Thy people for Thy goodness; and guide us on in the fulfillment of Thine own divine plan for us as a Nation. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, December 29, 1914.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask that the further reading of the Jour-

nal may be dispensed with.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to hear it read this morning. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah object?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah objects, and the Secretary will read the Journal.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented the credentials of Wesley L. Jones, chosen by the electors of the State of Washington a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and ordered to be filed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Dodge, Schleswig, and Dubuque, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pleasant Valley, Kans., and a petition of the members of the ladies' classes of the Methodist Sunday School of Luray, Kans., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the

Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have received a number of communications from citizens of the State of North Dakota urging the passage of legislation at the present session of Congress prohibiting the sale of munitions of war to the belligerent nations of Europe. I ask that the communications may be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Without objection, it is so The PRESIDENT pro tempore.

ordered.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] has just said, I wish to state that I have also received hundreds of individual letters and many petitions on the same subject, in reference to Senate 6688, the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hitchcock]. I do not feel like presenting all the letters and having them printed in the RECORD, but I simply call the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the Senate to the fact that I have received several hundred letters